arXiv:1510.00801v1 [math.AP] 3 Oct 2015

RELATIVE ENERGY FOR THE KORTEWEG THEORY AND RELATED HAMILTONIAN FLOWS IN GAS DYNAMICS

JAN GIESSELMANN, CORRADO LATTANZIO, AND ATHANASIOS E. TZAVARAS

Abstract. For an Euler system, with dynamics generated by a potential energy functional, we propose a functional format for the relative energy and derive a relative energy identity. The latter, when applied to specific energies, yields relative energy identities for the Euler-Korteweg, the Euler-Poisson, the Quantum Hydrodynamics system, and low order approximations of the Euler-Korteweg system. For the Euler-Korteweg system we prove a stability theorem between a weak and a strong solution and an associated weak-strong uniqueness theorem. In the second part we focus on the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system (NSK) with non-monotone pressure laws: we prove stability for the NSK system via a modified relative energy approach. We prove continuous dependence of solutions on initial data and convergence of solutions of a low order model to solutions of the NSK system. The last two results provide physically meaningful examples of how higher order regularization terms enable the use of the relative energy framework for models with energies which are not poly- or quasi-convex, but compensating via higher-order gradients.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Hamiltonian flow and the relative energy 6
2.1. The relative potential energy 8
2.2. The relative kinetic energy 9
2.3. The functional form of the relative energy formula 10
2.4. The Euler-Korteweg system 10
2.5. The Euler-Poisson system 15
2.6. Order parameter approximation of the Euler-Korteweg system 17
2.7. Remarks on the Hamiltonian structure of the problem 19
3. Weak-strong stability for the Euler-Korteweg system 20
3.1. The energy identity 21
3.2. Relative energy estimate for weak solutions 21
3.3. Stability estimates for weak solutions in energy norms and constant capillarity 27
3.4. Stability estimates for L^∞ weak solutions and general capillarity 28
4. Stability estimates for non-convex energies 30
4.1. Assumptions 30
4.2. Continuous dependence on initial data 31
5. Model convergence 34
5.1. Assumptions on well-posedness and uniform bounds 35

JG partially supported by the German Research Foundation (DFG) via SFB TRR 75 'Tropfendynamische Prozesse unter extremen Umgebungsbedingungen'.

AET acknowledges the support of the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST) and of the Aristeia program of the Greek Secretariat for Research through the project DIKICOMA.

5.2. Elliptic approximation 37
5.3. Relative energy 37
Appendix A. Noether's theorem and the Korteweg stress 43
Appendix B. The relative energy transport identity for the Euler-Korteweg system 43
Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 5.9 48
References 50

1. Introduction

We study the system of partial differential equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) = 0 \\ \frac{Du}{Dt} := &\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u \cdot \nabla_x)u = -\nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho) \end{aligned} \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,,\ t > 0\,, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\rho \geq 0$ is a density obeying the conservation of mass equation, u is the fluid velocity and $m = \rho u$ the momentum flux. The dynamical equation determining the evolution of u is generated by a functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ on the density and $\frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}$ stands for the generator of the directional derivative of that functional. The dynamics (1.1) formally satisfies the conservation of energy equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int \tfrac{1}{2}\rho |u|^2 \, dx + \mathcal{E}(\rho) \right) = 0\,. \tag{1.2}$$

Depending on the selection of the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ several models of interest fit under this framework (see Section 2). These include the equations of isentropic gas dynamics, the Euler-Poisson system (*e.g.* [31, 28, 22]) the system of quantum hydrodynamics (*e.g.* [1]), the Euler-Korteweg system (*e.g.* [15, 3]), and order-parameter models for the study of phase transitions (*e.g.* [4, 32, 33]). The objective here is to review the relation of these problems with the formal structure (1.1) and to use the structure in order to obtain a relative entropy identity. The idea is quite simple: most (but not all) of the problems above are generated by convex functionals. It is natural to use the quadratic part of the Taylor expansion of the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$,

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) := \mathcal{E}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}(\bar\rho) - \left\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\bar\rho), \rho - \bar\rho \right\rangle, \tag{1.3}$$

as a measure for comparing two states $\rho(t,\cdot)$ and $\bar\rho(t,\cdot)$. This definition involves the directional derivative of $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ in the direction $(\rho - \bar\rho)$ and provides a functional called here relative potential energy. This is used along with the relative kinetic energy

$$K(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m) = \int \rho \Big| \frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho} \Big|^2 dx \tag{1.4}$$

as a yardstick for comparing the distance between two solutions (ρ, u) and $(\bar\rho, \bar u)$. An additional ingredient is needed: we postulate the existence of a stress tensor (functional) $S(\rho)$ such that

$$-\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} = \nabla_x \cdot S\,. \tag{1.5}$$

Hypothesis (1.5) holds for all the above examples, it gives a meaning to the notion of weak solutions for (1.1) as it induces a conservative form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) &= \nabla_x \cdot S\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

and plays an instrumental role in devising a relative entropy identity. For the Euler-Korteweg system it is a consequence of the invariance under translations of the generating functional and Noether's theorem (see [3] and Appendix A). The relative energy identity takes the abstract form

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) + \int \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\right) \\ &\qquad = \int \nabla_x \bar u : S(\rho|\bar\rho)\,dx - \int \rho \nabla_x \bar u : (u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)\,dx\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1.7}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)$ is defined in (1.3), while the relative stress functional is

$$S(\rho|\bar\rho) := S(\rho) - S(\bar\rho) - \Big\langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta \rho}(\bar\rho), \rho - \bar\rho \Big\rangle\,. \tag{1.8}$$

Formula (1.7) is the main result of this article. It should be compared to the well known relative entropy formulas initiated in the works Dafermos [9, 10], DiPerna[13] and analogs that have been successfully used in many contexts (*e.g.* [24, 27, 17, 6, 25, 19]). It has however a different origin from all these calculations: while the latter are based on the thermodynamical structure induced by the Clausius-Duhem inequality, the formula (1.7) is based on the abstract Hamiltonian flow structure in (1.1). The reader familiar with the ramifications of continuum thermodynamics will observe that, as noted by Dunn and Serrin [15], constitutive theories with higher-order gradients (unless trivial) are inconsistent with the Clausius-Duhem structure, and in order to make them compatible one has to introduce the interstitial work term in the energy equation. Nevertheless, as shown in Sections 2.1-2.3, the structure (1.1), (1.5) induces a relative entropy identity provided $\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)$ is defined through the Taylor expansion of the generating functional.

Despite this difference, there is also striking similarity between the formulas obtained in [10, 25] and the formula (1.7) in connection to the mechanical interpretations for the relative mechanical stress and the relative convective stress. This similarity is conceptually quite appealing, yet the simplicity of the formula (1.7) is somewhat misleading. In fact, the actual formulas in specific examples are cumbersome, as can be noticed in Section 2.4 in formula (2.31) derived for the Euler-Korteweg system, or in Section 2.5 in the relative energy formula (2.52) for the Euler-Poisson system. In addition, the simplicity of the derivation using the functional framework presented in Sections 2.1, 2.2 should be contrasted to the lengthy direct derivation in Appendix B for the Euler-Korteweg system.

Our work is closely related to the observations of Benzoni-Gavage et al. [2, 3] that the Euler-Korteweg system can be formally expressed for irrotational flow velocity fields as a Hamiltonian system. While for general flows the structure of the problem fails to be Hamiltonian (see (2.65)), this discrepancy is consistent with energy conservation and as shown here induces with (1.5) the relative energy identity.

Gradient flows generated by functionals $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ in Wasserstein distance give rise to parabolic equations

$$\partial_t \rho = \nabla_x \cdot \rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} \tag{1.9}$$

and have received ample attention in multiple contexts (*e.g.* [30, 7]). Such systems can be seen as describing the long-time response of an Euler equation with friction (see (2.1) where the effect of a frictional term are added). At long times the friction term tends to equilibrate with the gradient of the energy, $\rho u \sim -\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}$, and produces the diffusion equation (1.9). A justification of this process using the relative energy framework is undertaken in a companion article [26], see also [25] for an earlier special instance of that limit.

In the second part of this work, we establish some applications of (1.7). We consider first the Euler-Korteweg system

$$\begin{cases} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) = 0 \\ \\ (\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) = -\rho \nabla_x \Big(F_\rho(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) - \operatorname{div}_x F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \Big) , \end{cases} \tag{1.10}$$

generated by a convex energy

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \int F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\, dx = \int h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2} \kappa(\rho) |\nabla_x \rho|^2 \, dx \tag{1.11}$$

and proceed to compare a conservative (or dissipative) weak solution (ρ, m) to a strong solution $(\bar\rho, \bar m)$ of (1.10). First, we establish the relative entropy transport formula for comparing solutions of this regularity classes in Theorem 3.2. This is in turn used to establish two stability results between weak and strong solutions of (1.10):

(i) Theorem 3.9 valid for convex energies (1.11) under the hypothesis that the density ρ of the weak solution is bounded while the density $\bar\rho$ of the strong solution does not include vacuum regions; this result generalizes to the class of energies (1.11) the result in [14] valid for energies with $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$, and in particular our result applies to the quantum hydrodynamics system (2.42).

(ii) Theorem 3.5 which restricts to convex energies (1.11) with constant capillarity ($\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$) and to strong solutions with density $\bar\rho$ bounded away from vacuum, but in return does not place any boundedness assumptions on the density ρ except for the natural energy norm bound.

Augmenting the Euler-Korteweg system with viscosity leads to the isothermal Navier-Stokes-Korteweg (NSK) model. When the capillarity coefficient $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa > 0$ is constant in (1.11) and the pressure function $p(\rho)$ is non-monotone, the NSK system

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ (\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x p(\rho) &= \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) + C_\kappa \rho \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho \, , \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

is a well-known model for compressible liquid-vapor flows undergoing phase transitions of diffuse interface type (*e.g.* [15, 3]). The term

$$\sigma[u] := \lambda \operatorname{div}_x(u) \mathbb{I} + \mu(\nabla_x u + (\nabla_x u)^T) \tag{1.13}$$

is the Navier-Stokes stress with coefficients λ, μ satisfying $\mu \geq 0$ and $\lambda + \frac{2}{d}\mu \geq 0$, and $\mathbb{I} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is the unit matrix and d the spatial dimension. To describe multi-phase flows the energy

density $h = h(\rho)$ is non-convex and the associated pressure $p'(\rho) = \rho h''(\rho)$ is non-monotone, so that the first order part of (1.12) is a system of mixed hyperbolic-elliptic type.

The relative entropy technique usually applies to situations where the energy is convex or at least quasi-convex or poly-convex [11, 24, 12]. Here we provide some examples on how – in a physically meaningful and multi-dimensional situation – the higher-order (second gradient) regularization mechanism compensates for the non-convexity of the energy in such a way that the relative entropy technique still provides stability estimates. This extends results from [19], valid in a one-dimensional Lagrangian setting. To highlight the use of a stability theory for (1.12) derived via a modified relative entropy approach, we prove two results:

(a) we show stability of smooth solutions to (1.12) or to the associated Korteweg-Euler system with non-monotone pressures for initial-data with equal initial mass.
(b) we show that solutions of a lower order approximation to the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system given by (1.14) below converge to solutions of (1.12) in the limit $\alpha \to \infty$.

To place (b) in the relevant context, we note that the system

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x(p(\rho) + C_\kappa \frac{\alpha}{2}\rho^2) &= \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) + C_\kappa \alpha \rho \nabla_x c \\ c - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c &= \rho\,, \end{aligned} \tag{1.14}$$

where C_κ is as in (2.38), and $\alpha > 0$ is a parameter, was introduced in [33] with the goal to approximate the NSK system. It has motivated very efficient numerical schemes for the numerical treatment of diffuse interface systems for the description of phase transitions (*cfr.* the discussion in the beginning of Section 5). The model convergence from (1.14) to (1.12) as $\alpha \to \infty$ was investigated in simple cases by [8] (using Fourier methods) and [19]. Here, we exploit the fact that the system (1.14) fits into the functional framework of (1.1), (1.5) and is thus equipped with a relative energy identity (see Section 2.6). Using the relative energy framework, as modified in Section 4 pertaining to non-monotone pressures, we prove in Theorem 5.14 convergence from (1.14) to (1.12) as $\alpha \to \infty$ for initial data of equal initial mass.

The structure of the paper is as follows: in Section 2 we discuss the derivation of the formal relative energy estimate (1.7) at the level of the abstract equation (1.1), and then we implement its application to various models: the Euler-Korteweg system in Section 2.4, the Euler-Poisson system in Section 2.5, and the order parameter model of lower order in Section 2.6. The relation between (1.1) and a Hamiltonian structure is discussed in Section 2.7. In Section 3 we consider the Euler-Korteweg system (1.10) and we establish the relative energy estimate for solutions of limited smoothness, that is between a dissipative (or conservative) weak solution and a strong solution of (1.10). We then derive the two weak-strong stability Theorems 3.5 and 3.9. In Section 4 we consider the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system (1.12) with non-monotone pressure $p(\rho)$, we present a relative energy calculation and show that solutions of (1.12) depend continuously on their initial data in Theorem 4.5. In Section 5 we briefly introduce the lower order model (5.1) and derive an estimate for the difference between solutions of (1.14) and (1.12). In the appendices we present: a remark on the relation of (1.5) to the invariance under spatial-translations of the energy functional and Noether's theorem in Appendix A; a direct derivation of the relative energy identity for the Euler-Korteweg system

(1.10) in Appendix B; the derivation of the relative energy identity for the lower order model (1.14) in Appendix C.

2. Hamiltonian flow and the relative energy

In this section we consider a system of equations consisting of a conservation of mass and a functional momentum equation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \rho \frac{Du}{Dt} &= -\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} - \zeta \rho u \,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where $\rho \geq 0$ is the density, u the velocity, and $\frac{D}{Dt} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} + u \cdot \nabla_x$ stands for the material derivative operator. In $(2.1)_2$, $\frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}$ stands for the generator of the first variation of the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ (see the discussion below). The term $(-\zeta \rho u)$ in (2.1) corresponds to a damping force with frictional coefficient $\zeta > 0$; the particular frictionless case $\zeta = 0$, leading to (1.1), is also allowed. The objective of the section is to derive the main relative entropy calculation of this work and to apply it to certain specific systems. The derivation is formal in nature and has to be validated via alternative methods for solutions of limited smoothness (*e.g.* for weak or for measure-valued solutions). Nevertheless, the formal derivation uses in an essential way the functional structure of (2.1) and it is fairly simple to achieve via this formalism.

In the sequel $\mathcal{E}[\rho]$ will stand for a functional on the density $\rho(\cdot, t)$. The directional derivative (Gateaux derivative) of the functional $\mathcal{E} : U \subset X \to \mathbb{R}$, where U is an open subset of X, a locally convex topological vector space, is defined by

$$d\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi) = \lim_{\tau \to 0} \frac{\mathcal{E}(\rho + \tau \psi) - \mathcal{E}(\rho)}{\tau} = \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{E}(\rho + \tau \psi) \Big|_{\tau = 0} \,,$$

with the limit taken over the reals. When the limit exists the functional is Gateaux differentiable at ρ and $d\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi)$ is the directional derivative. The function $d\mathcal{E}(\rho, \cdot)$ is homogeneous of degree one, but may in general fail to be linear (in ψ). We will assume that $d\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi)$ is linear in ψ and can be represented via a duality bracket

$$d\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \mathcal{E}(\rho + \tau \psi) \Big|_{\tau = 0} = \big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \psi \big\rangle \,, \tag{2.2}$$

with $\frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho)$ standing for the generator of the bracket.

Further, we define the second variation via

$$d^2\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi, \varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho + \varepsilon \varphi), \psi \big\rangle - \big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \psi \big\rangle}{\varepsilon}$$

(whenever the limit exists) and we assume that this can be represented as a bilinear functional in the form

$$d^2\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi, \varphi) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \frac{\big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho + \varepsilon \varphi), \psi \big\rangle - \big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \psi \big\rangle}{\varepsilon} = \Big\langle \Big\langle \frac{\delta^2 \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho^2}(\rho), (\psi, \varphi) \Big\rangle \Big\rangle \,. \tag{2.3}$$

We note that (2.2) and (2.3) hold when the functional $\mathcal{E}[\rho]$ is Fréchet differentiable on a Banach space X and with sufficient smoothness. Moreover, in a framework when X is a Fréchet space (locally convex topological vector space that is metrizable) there are available theorems that show that continuity of $d\mathcal{E}(\rho, \psi) : X \times X \to \mathbb{R}$ guarantees the linearity of $d\mathcal{E}(\rho, \cdot)$; corresponding theorems also hold for the second variation; see [21, Sec I.3]. In the

following formal calculations we will place (2.2) and (2.3) as hypotheses and will validate them for two examples: the Euler-Korteweg and the Euler-Poisson system.

By standard calculations the system (2.1) can be expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) &= -\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} - \zeta \rho u \,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The left part of (2.4) is in conservation form, however this is not generally true for the term $\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}$. Nevertheless, for all examples of interest here it will turn out that

$$-\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} = \nabla_x \cdot S \,, \tag{2.5}$$

where $S = S(\rho)$ will be a tensor-valued functional on ρ that plays the role of a stress tensor and has components $S_{ij}(\rho)$ with $i, j = 1, ..., d$.

At this stage (2.5) is placed as a hypothesis. This hypothesis is validated in the sequel for various specific models. It also turns out that it is a fairly general consequence of the invariance of the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ under space translations via Noether's theorem (see appendix). Note that (2.5) gives a meaning to weak solutions for (2.4) and is instrumental in the forthcoming calculations for the potential, kinetic and total energy. It is assumed that no work is done at the boundaries and thus integrations by parts do not result to boundary contributions. In particular they are valid for periodic boundary conditions ($x \in \mathbb{T}^d$ the torus) or on the entire space ($x \in \mathbb{R}^d$).

The potential energy is computed via

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\rho) \overset{(2.2)}{=} \langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \rho_t \rangle \overset{(2.1)}{=} -\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) \rangle \overset{(2.5)}{=} \int S : \nabla_x u \, dx \,. \tag{2.6}$$

Taking the inner product of $(2.1)_2$ by u gives

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\rho \frac{D}{Dt}|u|^2 = -u \cdot \rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} - \zeta \rho |u|^2 \overset{(2.5)}{=} u \cdot \operatorname{div}_x S - \zeta \rho |u|^2 \,.$$

Then, using $(2.1)_1$, we obtain

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\partial_t(\rho|u|^2) + \operatorname{div}_x(\tfrac{1}{2}\rho|u|^2 u) = u \cdot \operatorname{div}_x S - \zeta \rho |u|^2 \,,$$

which leads to the evolution of the kinetic energy

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|u|^2 \, dx = -\int \left(S : \nabla_x u + \zeta \rho |u|^2 \right) dx \,. \tag{2.7}$$

Combining (2.6) and (2.7) provides the balance of total energy

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\int \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|u|^2 \, dx + \mathcal{E}(\rho) \right) = -\zeta \int \rho |u|^2 \, dx \,. \tag{2.8}$$

In the frictionless case $\zeta = 0$ the total energy is conserved, while for $\zeta > 0$ there is dissipation due to friction.

2.1. **The relative potential energy.** Consider now the system (2.1) generated by the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ and assume that the functional is convex. A natural quantity to monitor is provided by the quadratic part of the Taylor series expansion of the functional with respect to a reference solution $\bar\rho(x,t)$; this quantity is called here relative potential energy and is defined by

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) := \mathcal{E}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}(\bar\rho) - \big\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), \rho-\bar\rho\big\rangle\,. \tag{2.9}$$

We next develop the relative potential energy calculation, which is based on the hypotheses (2.2), (2.3), (2.5) and (2.11) below. For φ_i a vector valued test function, $i=1,...,d$, the weak form of (2.5) reads

$$\big\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho), \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho\varphi_j)\big\rangle = -\int S_{ij}(\rho)\,\frac{\partial\varphi_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx\,, \tag{2.10}$$

where we employ the summation convention over repeated indices.

Recall that the stress $S(\rho)$ is a functional on the density ρ. We assume that the directional derivative of S is expressed as a linear functional via a duality bracket,

$$dS(\rho;\psi) = \frac{d}{d\tau}S(\rho+\tau\psi)\Big|_{\tau=0} = \big\langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta\rho}(\rho),\psi\big\rangle\,, \tag{2.11}$$

in terms of the generator $\frac{\delta S}{\delta\rho}(\rho)$ (in complete analogy to (2.2)).

We now take the directional derivative of (2.10) – viewed as a functional in ρ – along a direction ψ, with ψ a smooth test function, and use (2.3), (2.11) to arrive at the formula

$$\Big\langle\Big\langle \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho^2}(\rho), \big(\psi, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\rho\varphi_j)\big)\Big\rangle\Big\rangle + \Big\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho), \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\psi\varphi_j)\Big\rangle = -\int \Big\langle \frac{\delta S_{ij}}{\delta\rho}(\rho),\psi\Big\rangle\,\frac{\partial\varphi_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx\,. \tag{2.12}$$

Let now (ρ,u) and $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$ be two smooth solutions of (2.1). Using (2.6), (2.1), we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\Big(\mathcal{E}(\rho)-\mathcal{E}(\bar\rho)-\big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\rho-\bar\rho\big\rangle\Big)\\
&\quad= \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho), -\operatorname{div}_x(\rho u)\big\rangle - \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), -\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\bar u)\big\rangle\\
&\qquad - \big\langle\big\langle\frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho^2}(\bar\rho),(\bar\rho_t,\rho-\bar\rho)\big\rangle\big\rangle + \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x(\rho u-\bar\rho\bar u)\big\rangle\\
&\quad= \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho), -\operatorname{div}_x(\rho u)\big\rangle - \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), -\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\bar u)\big\rangle + \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\big\rangle\\
&\qquad - \big\langle\big\langle\frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho^2}(\bar\rho),(\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\bar u),\rho-\bar\rho)\big\rangle\big\rangle + \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x\big((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar u\big)\big\rangle\\
&\quad\overset{(2.10),(2.12)}{=} \big\langle S_{ij}(\rho),\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial x_j}\big\rangle - \big\langle S_{ij}(\bar\rho),\frac{\partial\bar u_i}{\partial x_j}\big\rangle - \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho)-\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\big\rangle\\
&\qquad - \big\langle S_{ij}(\rho),\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(u_i-\bar u_i)\big\rangle - \int\Big\langle\frac{\delta S_{ij}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\rho-\bar\rho\Big\rangle\,\frac{\partial\bar u_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx\\
&\quad= \int\Big(S_{ij}(\rho)-S_{ij}(\bar\rho)-\big\langle\frac{\delta S_{ij}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\rho-\bar\rho\big\rangle\Big)\frac{\partial\bar u_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx - \big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho)-\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\big\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

We next define the relative stress tensor

$$S(\rho|\bar\rho) := S(\rho) - S(\bar\rho) - \big\langle\frac{\delta S}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\rho-\bar\rho\big\rangle \tag{2.13}$$

and conclude with the relative potential energy balance

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) = \int S_{ij}(\rho|\bar\rho)\frac{\partial \bar u_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx - \Big\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), \mathrm{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\Big\rangle\,. \tag{2.14}$$

2.2. **The relative kinetic energy.** Next consider the kinetic energy functional

$$K(\rho,m) = \int \frac12\frac{|m|^2}{\rho}dx \tag{2.15}$$

viewed as a functional on the density ρ and the momentum $m=\rho u$. The integrand of this functional, $k(\rho,m)=\frac12\frac{|m|^2}{\rho}$, has Hessian the $(d+1)\times(d+1)$ matrix

$$\nabla^2_{(\rho,m)}k = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^3} & -\frac{m^T}{\rho^2} \\ -\frac{m}{\rho^2} & \frac{1}{\rho}\mathbb{I}_{d\times d}\end{pmatrix}\,,$$

which has eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 = 0,\ \lambda_2 = ... = \lambda_d = \frac{1}{\rho} > 0,\ \lambda_{d+1} = \frac{1}{\rho} + \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^3} > 0\,,$$

and is positive semidefinite for $\rho>0$. The kinetic energy functional $K(\rho,m)$ is convex (though not strictly convex) as a functional in (ρ,m).

The relative kinetic energy is easily expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} K(\rho,m|\bar\rho,\bar m) &:= \int k(\rho,m) - k(\bar\rho,\bar m) - \nabla k(\bar\rho,\bar m)\cdot(\rho-\bar\rho, m-\bar m)\,dx \\ &= \int \frac12\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} - \frac12\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho} - \big(-\frac12\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}, \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\big)\cdot(\rho-\bar\rho, m-\bar m)\,dx \\ &= \int \frac12\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

To compute the evolution of the relative kinetic energy, we consider the difference of the two equations $(2.1)_2$ satisfied by (ρ,u) and $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$,

$$\partial_t(u-\bar u) + (u\cdot\nabla_x)(u-\bar u) + \big((u-\bar u)\cdot\nabla_x\big)\bar u = -\nabla_x\Big(\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho)\Big) - \zeta(u-\bar u)$$

and take the inner product with $(u-\bar u)$ to deduce

$$\frac12\frac{D}{Dt}|u-\bar u|^2 + \nabla_x\bar u : (u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u) = -(u-\bar u)\cdot\nabla_x\Big(\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho)\Big) - \zeta|u-\bar u|^2\,,$$

which, using $(2.1)_1$, is expressed in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t\big(\tfrac12\rho|u-\bar u|^2\big) + \mathrm{div}_x\big(\tfrac12\rho u|u-\bar u|^2\big) &= -\rho\nabla_x\bar u : (u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u) \\ &\quad -\rho(u-\bar u)\cdot\nabla_x\Big(\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho)\Big) - \zeta\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating over space leads to the balance of the relative kinetic energy

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\int\frac12\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx + \zeta\int\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx \\ &\quad = -\int\rho\nabla_x\bar u : (u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)\,dx + \Big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) - \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), \mathrm{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\Big\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

2.3. **The functional form of the relative energy formula.** Combining (2.14) with (2.17) we obtain the equation for the evolution of the (total) relative energy

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\left(\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)+\int \tfrac12\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\right)+\zeta\int\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\\ =\int\nabla_x\bar u:S(\rho|\bar\rho)\,dx-\int\rho\nabla_x\bar u:(u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)\,dx\,,\end{aligned}\tag{2.18}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)$ and $S(\rho|\bar\rho)$ stand for the relative potential energy and relative stress functionals defined in (2.9) and (2.13), respectively.

An interesting feature of these calculation is how the contributions of the term

$$D=\big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho)-\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho),\operatorname{div}_x\big(\rho(u-\bar u)\big)\big\rangle$$

in (2.14) and (2.17) offset each other, in complete analogy to the workings of the derivation of the total energy (2.8) from the potential (2.6) and kinetic (2.7) energies. The errors are again formally quadratic in nature as in the corresponding calculations of [9] for the system of thermoelasticity, but now functionals are involved in the final formulas.

While this abstract derivation has some elegance and ease of derivation, it has the drawback that it requires smoothness for the fields (ρ,u) and $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$. In applications the relative energy is often used to compare a weak to a strong solution; in such cases the calculation has to be rederived by alternate means for solutions of limited smoothness. Indeed, this is done for the Euler-Korteweg system in Section 3.2 and Appendix B.

The calculation is next applied to various specific examples: the Euler-Korteweg system, the Euler-Poisson system, and order parameter approximations of the Euler-Korteweg system.

2.4. **The Euler-Korteweg system.** The functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho)=\int F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\,dx\tag{2.19}$$

generated by the smooth function $F=F(\rho,q):\mathbb{R}^+\times\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{R}$ is associated to the Korteweg theory of capillarity; the dynamics of (2.1) or (2.4) along the functional (2.19) generates the Euler-Korteweg system.

For the functional (2.19) we next explore the precise meaning of the formulas (2.2) and (2.3). Note that, for a test function ψ,

$$\begin{aligned}d\mathcal{E}(\rho;\psi)&=\frac{d}{d\tau}\mathcal{E}(\rho+\tau\psi)\Big|_{\tau=0}\\&=\frac{d}{d\tau}\Big|_{\tau=0}\int F(\rho+\tau\psi,\nabla_x\rho+\tau\nabla_x\psi)\,dx\\&=\int\Big(F_\rho(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\psi+F_q(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\cdot\nabla_x\psi\Big)\,dx\\&=:\big\langle\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho),\psi\big\rangle\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.20}$$

This defines the meaning of the bracket $\langle\cdot,\psi\rangle$ as the duality bracket between H^{-1} and H^1_0 and identifies the generator $\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}$ as

$$\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho)=F_\rho(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)-\nabla_x\cdot F_q(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\,.\tag{2.21}$$

Next, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} d^2\mathcal{E}(\rho;\psi,\phi) &= \lim_{\varepsilon\to 0} \frac{\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho+\varepsilon\phi),\psi\rangle - \langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho),\psi\rangle}{\varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{d}{d\varepsilon}\Big|_{\varepsilon=0} \int \Big(F_\rho(\rho+\varepsilon\phi,\nabla_x\rho+\varepsilon\nabla_x\phi)\psi + F_q(\rho+\varepsilon\phi,\nabla_x\rho+\varepsilon\nabla_x\phi)\cdot\nabla_x\psi\Big)\,dx \\ &= \int \Big(F_{\rho\rho}\,\phi\psi + \psi F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x\phi + \phi F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x\psi + F_{qq} : (\nabla_x\phi\otimes\nabla_x\psi)\Big)\,dx \\ &= \int (\phi,\nabla_x\phi)\cdot \begin{pmatrix} F_{\rho\rho} & F_{\rho q} \\ F_{\rho q} & F_{qq}\end{pmatrix} (\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\begin{pmatrix}\psi\\ \nabla_x\psi\end{pmatrix}\,dx \\ &=: \left\langle \left\langle \frac{\delta^2\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho^2}(\rho),(\psi,\phi)\right\rangle\right\rangle , \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

where the last equation defines the meaning of the bracket $\langle\langle\cdot,(\phi,\psi)\rangle\rangle$ and we have used the notations $F_q=\nabla_q F$ and $F_{qq}=\nabla_q^2 F$. It is clear that $d^2\mathcal{E}(\rho;\psi,\varphi)$ is a bilinear form and also that the convexity of F implies that the second variation of $\mathcal{E}$ is positive.

Using (2.20) (for the test function $\psi=\rho-\bar\rho$) we compute the relative potential energy in (2.9) and express it in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) &= \int \Big(F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho) - F(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) - F_\rho(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho) - F_q(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\cdot(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\Big)\,dx \\ &= \int F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\,\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,dx\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.23}$$

where $F(\rho,q|\bar\rho,\bar q)$ stands for the quadratic Taylor polynomial of $F(\rho,q)$ around $(\bar\rho,\bar q)$.

The Euler-Korteweg system (with friction when $\zeta>0$) of the form (2.1) generated by the Korteweg functional (2.19) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t} + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \rho\Big[\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u\cdot\nabla_x)u\Big] &= -\rho\nabla_x\big(F_\rho - \nabla_x\cdot F_q\big) - \zeta\rho u\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

By direct computation, one checks the formula

$$\begin{aligned} -\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho} &= -\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\big(F_\rho - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}F_{q_k}\big) \\ &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\big(\rho F_\rho - \rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}F_{q_k}\big) + \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x_i}F_\rho + \frac{\partial^2\rho}{\partial x_i\partial x_k}F_{q_k} - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\big(\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x_i}F_{q_k}\big) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}\Big(\big(F-\rho F_\rho+\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}F_{q_k}\big)\,\delta_{ij} - \frac{\partial\rho}{\partial x_i}F_{q_j}\Big) \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}S_{ij}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.25}$$

where the Korteweg stress tensor is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} S &= (F-\rho F_\rho+\rho\operatorname{div}_x F_q)\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x\rho\otimes F_q \\ &= \Big[(F-\rho F_\rho-(\nabla_x\rho)\cdot F_q) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho F_q)\Big]\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x\rho\otimes F_q\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

with $\mathbb{I}$ the identity matrix and $P = \rho F_\rho - F$ the pressure. For the stress tensor to be symmetric it is often required that $F_q = a(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\nabla_x \rho$ with a a scalar valued function. The following expression of $S(\rho)$ will be convenient for expressing the relative stress:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ij}(\rho) &= \big(F - \rho F_\rho - \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_k} F_{q_k}\big)\,\delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\big(\rho F_{q_k}\big)\,\delta_{ij} - \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_i} F_{q_j} \\ &= -s(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\delta_{ij} + \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k} r_k(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\Big)\delta_{ij} - H_{ij}(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

where the functions $s : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$, $r : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ and $H : \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} s(\rho, q) &= \rho F_\rho(\rho, q) + q \cdot F_q(\rho, q) - F(\rho, q)\,, \\ r(\rho, q) &= \rho F_q(\rho, q)\,, \\ H(\rho, q) &= q \otimes F_q(\rho, q)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

We proceed to compute the relative stress tensor defined in (2.13). $S(\rho)$ is viewed as a functional and using (2.27) we compute, for a test function ϕ, the first variation of $S_{ij}(\rho)$ via the formula

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{d\tau}\bigg|_{\tau=0} S_{ij}(\rho + \tau\phi) \\ &\quad = -(s_\rho \phi + s_q \cdot \nabla_x \phi)\delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\Big(\frac{\partial r_k}{\partial \rho}\phi + \frac{\partial r_k}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_l}\Big)\delta_{ij} - \Big(\frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial \rho}\phi + \frac{\partial H_{ij}}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial x_l}\Big) \\ &\quad = \langle \frac{\delta S_{ij}}{\delta \rho}, \phi\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.29}$$

Note that (2.29) gives a meaning to the bracket defining the first variation of the Korteweg stress tensor.

In turn, using (2.27), (2.13) and (2.29) (with $\rho \to \bar\rho$ and for the choice of $\phi = \rho - \bar\rho$) we obtain an expression for the relative stress Korteweg tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} S_{ij}(\rho|\bar\rho) &= S_{ij}(\rho) - S_{ij}(\bar\rho) - \big\langle \frac{\delta S_{ij}}{\delta \rho}(\bar\rho), \rho - \bar\rho\big\rangle \\ &= -s(\rho, \nabla_x \rho|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\Big(r_k(\rho, \nabla_x \rho|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\Big)\delta_{ij} - H_{ij}(\rho, \nabla_x \rho|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

where, as usual,

$$s(\rho, q|\bar\rho, \bar q) = s(\rho, q) - s(\bar\rho, \bar q) - s_\rho(\bar\rho, \bar q)(\rho - \bar\rho) - s_q(\bar\rho, \bar q)\cdot(q - \bar q)$$

stands for the quadratic part of the Taylor expansion for the function $s(\rho, q)$ and similarly for the functions $r(\rho, q)$ and $H(\rho, q)$.

We conclude by stating the relative energy formula induced by (2.18) for the specific case of the Euler-Korteweg system (2.24). Using (2.23) and (2.30), we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\Big(\int F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\,\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)+\tfrac12\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\Big)+\zeta\int\rho|u-\bar u|^2\,dx\\ =-\int\Big[(\operatorname{div}_x\bar u)\,s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)+\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\operatorname{div}_x\bar u\Big)r_k(\rho,\nabla_x\rho|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\\ +\nabla_x\bar u:H((\rho,\nabla_x\rho|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\Big]\,dx\\ -\int\rho\nabla_x\bar u:(u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)\,dx\,.\end{aligned}\tag{2.31}$$

Special choices of the energy functional (2.19) lead to some frequently occurring systems in fluid dynamics. Some of them are reviewed below:

2.4.1. *The Euler system of isentropic gas flow.* The choice

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho)=\int h(\rho)\,dx\,,\quad S=-p(\rho)\mathbb{I}\,,\tag{2.32}$$

$$p(\rho)=\rho h'(\rho)-h(\rho)\,,\tag{2.33}$$

produces the Euler system of compressible isentropic gas dynamics. The resulting relative energy formula coincides with the one computed in [10] and [25].

2.4.2. *Special instances of the Euler-Korteweg system.* An often used functional, within the framework of the Korteweg theory, is

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho)=\int\Big(h(\rho)+\tfrac12\kappa(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho|^2\Big)\,dx\,.\tag{2.34}$$

The formulas (2.25) and (2.27) now become

$$-\rho\nabla_x\Big(h'(\rho)+\tfrac12\kappa'(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho|^2-\operatorname{div}_x(\kappa(\rho)\nabla\rho)\Big)=\nabla_x\cdot S\,,\tag{2.35}$$

$$S=\Big[-p(\rho)-\tfrac12\big(\rho\kappa'(\rho)+\kappa(\rho)\big)|\nabla_x\rho|^2+\nabla_x\cdot\big(\rho\kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\big)\Big]\mathbb{I}-\kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\otimes\nabla_x\rho\,,\tag{2.36}$$

and the system (2.4) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial\rho}{\partial t}+\operatorname{div}_x(\rho u)&=0\\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u)+\operatorname{div}_x(\rho u\otimes u)&=\nabla_x\Big(-p(\rho)-\tfrac12(\rho\kappa'(\rho)+\kappa(\rho))|\nabla_x\rho|^2+\operatorname{div}_x\big(\rho\kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\big)\Big)\\ &\quad-\operatorname{div}_x(\kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\otimes\nabla_x\rho)-\zeta\rho u\,,\end{aligned}\tag{2.37}$$

where $p=\rho h'-h$. As shown later in Lemma 3.7 the convexity of the functional (2.34) is equivalent to the hypotheses

$$h''(\rho)=\frac{p'(\rho)}{\rho}>0\,,\quad\kappa(\rho)>0\,,\quad\kappa(\rho)\kappa''(\rho)-2(\kappa'(\rho))^2\geq0\,.$$

2.4.3. *The Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system.* The Euler-Korteweg model can be augmented by viscosity leading to the isothermal Navier-Stokes-Korteweg (NSK) system which is a well-known model for compressible liquid-vapor flows undergoing phase transitions. It is a so-called diffuse interface model in which the fields are not discontinuous at the phase boundary, but undergo change smoothly from states in the one phase to states in the other, though usually steep gradients do occur. For the choice $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa = const.$ the NSK model reads

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ (\rho u)_t + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x p(\rho) &= \mathrm{div}_x(\sigma[u]) + C_\kappa \rho \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho \,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.38}$$

where

$$\sigma[u] := \lambda \,\mathrm{div}_x(u)\mathbb{I} + \mu(\nabla_x u + (\nabla_x u)^T) \tag{2.39}$$

is the Navier-Stokes stress with coefficients λ, μ satisfying $\mu \geq 0$ and $\lambda + \frac{2}{d}\mu \geq 0$. Note that following (2.26) the third order term in the momentum balance can be written in divergence form. The potential energy for NSK is the same as for Euler-Korteweg. Adding in viscosity introduces a dissipative mechanism which actually helps with our relative energy calculations and which increases regularity of solutions.

The first order part of (2.38) is hyperbolic when p is monotone. The non-monotone pressure makes the first order part of (2.38) a system of mixed hyperbolic-elliptic type. It should be emphasized, that for (2.38) to describe multi-phase flows it is mandatory that the energy density $h = h(\rho)$, related to the pressure by (2.33), is non-convex, which makes the pressure non-monotone. We refer to [15] for a discussion of the thermodynamic structure of (2.38) and its relation to higher-order gradient theories. Also, to [3, 2] for a discussion of the general structure of Euler-Korteweg and Navier-Stokes-Korteweg models.

2.4.4. *The Quantum Hydrodynamics system.* Another special case arises when in (2.34) we set $\kappa(\rho) = \frac{1}{4}\frac{\varepsilon^2}{\rho}$, where ε is a constant (the Planck constant). This leads to the energy

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \int \Big(h(\rho) + \frac{1}{8}\varepsilon^2 \frac{1}{\rho} |\nabla_x \rho|^2 \Big)\, dx = \int \Big(h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 |\nabla_x \sqrt{\rho}|^2 \Big)\, dx \,. \tag{2.40}$$

In that case we have the identities

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\rho \nabla_x \Big(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} \Delta_x \sqrt{\rho} \Big) \quad &= \quad \rho \nabla_x \Big(\frac{1}{8\rho^2} |\nabla_x \rho|^2 + \mathrm{div}_x \big(\frac{1}{4\rho} \nabla_x \rho \big) \Big) \\ &\overset{(2.35),(2.36)}{=} \nabla_x \cdot \Big(\frac{1}{4} \Delta_x \rho \, \mathbb{I} - \frac{1}{4\rho} \nabla_x \rho \otimes \nabla_x \rho \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{2.41}$$

and (2.37) becomes (for $\zeta = 0$) the quantum hydrodynamics system (QHD)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \,, \\ \frac{\partial \rho u}{\partial t} + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) + \nabla_x p(\rho) &= \tfrac{\varepsilon^2}{2} \rho \nabla_x \left(\frac{\Delta_x \sqrt{\rho}}{\sqrt{\rho}} \right) . \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

We refer to [1] for details on the existence theory of finite energy weak solutions of the QHD system and detailed references on this interesting subject.

2.5. **The Euler-Poisson system.** As a second application we consider the Euler-Poisson system,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + \mathrm{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0\,, \\ \rho\Big(\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + (u\cdot\nabla_x)u\Big) &= -\nabla_x p(\rho) + \rho\nabla_x c\,, \\ -\Delta_x c + \beta c &= \rho - <\rho>\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.43}$$

which is often used for describing charged gases in semiconductor devices or under the influence of a gravitational field. Here, $p(\rho)$ is the pressure of the gas of charged particles and $\nabla_x c$ is the electrostatic force induced by the charged particles. The constant $\beta \geq 0$ is often referred as screening constant while $<\rho>$ stands for the average charge. The problem can be set either on the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ or on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Here, we restrict on the case of the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ and leave to the reader to provide the necessary modifications for $\mathbb{R}^d$. Also, we restrict to the frictionless case ($\zeta = 0$), it is straightforward to adapt and include frictional effects. Our objective is to recast (2.43) under the framework of (2.1); as a byproduct we will infer a relative energy calculation.

Consider the functional

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\rho) &= \int \Big(h(\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}\rho c\Big)\,dx\,, \\ \text{where } c \text{ is the solution of} \qquad & -\Delta_x c + \beta c = \rho - <\rho>\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

with $<\rho> = \int \rho dx$, $\beta \geq 0$. The elliptic equation $(2.44)_2$ is solvable on $\mathbb{T}^d$. It has a unique solution for $\beta > 0$ while the solution is given in terms of an arbitrary constant for $\beta = 0$. This constant plays no role in determining the electrostatic force $\nabla_x c$ and might be precised by requiring $\int c = 0$ for $\beta = 0$. With these remarks one may express the solution operator in terms of the Green's function using the convolution

$$c(x) = (\mathcal{K} * \rho)(x) = \int \mathcal{K}(x-y)\rho(y)\,dy\,,$$

where the kernel $\mathcal{K}$ is a symmetric function. Then $\mathcal{E}$ is expressed in the equivalent form

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \int \Big(h(\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}\rho(\mathcal{K}*\rho)\Big)\,dx\,. \tag{2.45}$$

We now compute, using the symmetry of $\mathcal{K}$, the directional derivative of $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{E}(\rho;\psi) &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\mathcal{E}(\rho+\tau\psi)\Big|_{\tau=0} \\ &= \int \Big(h'(\rho)\psi - \tfrac{1}{2}\psi(\mathcal{K}*\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}\rho(\mathcal{K}*\psi)\Big)\,dx \\ &= \int (h'(\rho) - \mathcal{K}*\rho)\psi\,dx \\ &= \Big\langle \frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho), \psi\Big\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.46}$$

We conclude that $\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) = h'(\rho) - \mathcal{K}*\rho$ and thus, if the pressure function $p(\rho)$ is connected with the energy (per unit volume) $h(\rho)$ through the usual thermodynamic relation $h'' = \frac{p'}{\rho}$, then the Euler-Poisson system is expressed in the form of the Hamiltonian flow (2.1) for the energy functional (2.45) (or equivalently (2.44)).

Next, we prove

$$-\rho\nabla_x\frac{\delta\mathcal{E}}{\delta\rho}(\rho) = -\rho\nabla_x(h'(\rho)-c) = \mathrm{div}_x\, S\,, \tag{2.47}$$

where

$$S = -\big(p(\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2 - \tfrac{\beta}{2}c^2 - <\rho> c\big)\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x c\otimes\nabla_x c\,. \tag{2.48}$$

Note that (2.47) validates the hypothesis (2.5) and its weak form (2.10) for the case of the Euler-Poisson system with the stress functional $S(\rho)$ defined by (2.48). To prove (2.47), note that if $(2.43)_3$ is multiplied by $\nabla_x c$ then after some rearrangement of terms we obtain

$$\rho\nabla_x c = \nabla_x\Big(\tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2 + \tfrac{\beta}{2}c^2 + <\rho> c\Big) - \mathrm{div}_x(\nabla_x c\otimes\nabla_x c)\,,$$

which readily provides, for $p' = \rho h''$, the formula

$$-\rho\nabla_x(h'(\rho)-c) = \mathrm{div}_x\Big(-\big[p(\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2 - \tfrac{\beta}{2}c^2 - <\rho> c\big]\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x c\otimes\nabla_x c\Big)$$

and expresses the stress in the form (2.48).

Suppose now that (ρ,u) with $c = \mathcal{K}*\rho$ and $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$ with $\bar c = \mathcal{K}*\bar\rho$ are two solutions of the Euler-Poisson system. Our goal is to identify the form that the abstract relative entropy identity takes for the specific case of the Euler-Poisson functional (2.45). First, using (2.9), (2.45) and (2.46) (for $\psi = \rho - \bar\rho$) we compute

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) = \int\Big(h(\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}\rho c - h(\bar\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}\bar\rho\bar c - (h'(\bar\rho)-\bar c)(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,dx\,.$$

Next, use the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} &h(\rho|\bar\rho) := h(\rho) - h(\bar\rho) - h'(\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho)\,,\\ &\int c\bar\rho = \int\bar c\rho\,, \qquad \text{since } \mathcal{K} \text{ is symmetric and } c = \mathcal{K}*\rho,\ \bar c = \mathcal{K}*\bar\rho\,, \end{aligned}$$

to recast $\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)$ in its final form

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho) = \int\Big(h(\rho|\bar\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}(\rho-\bar\rho)\mathcal{K}*(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,dx\,. \tag{2.49}$$

Note that for the case considered here, of an electrically attracting fluid, the relative energy consists of two competing terms, and to exploit the relative energy $\mathcal{E}(\rho|\bar\rho)$ additional considerations will be needed. These are undertaken in a companion work [26].

The relative stress functional $S(\rho|\bar\rho)$ defined in (2.13) is computed as follows for the Euler-Poisson case. First, we compute the directional derivative of the stress functional (2.48): for

ψ a test function, $c = \mathcal{K} * \rho$ and $C = \mathcal{K} * \psi$, the variation of $S(\rho)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} dS[\rho,\psi] &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big|_{\tau=0} S(\rho+\varepsilon\psi) \\ &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\Big|_{\tau=0} \Big(\big[-p(\rho+\tau\psi) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x c + \tau\nabla_x C|^2 + \tfrac{\beta}{2}(c+\tau C)^2 + <\rho+\tau\psi>(c+\tau C)\big]\mathbb{I} \\ &\qquad - (\nabla_x c + \tau\nabla_x C)\otimes(\nabla_x c + \tau\nabla_x C)\Big) \\ &= \big[-p'(\rho)\psi + \nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\rho)\cdot\nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\psi) + \beta(\mathcal{K}*\rho)(\mathcal{K}*\psi) + <\psi>\mathcal{K}*\rho + <\rho>\mathcal{K}*\psi\big]\mathbb{I} \\ &\quad - \nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\psi)\otimes\nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\rho) - \nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\rho)\otimes\nabla_x(\mathcal{K}*\psi) \\ &=: \langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta\rho}(\rho), \psi\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.50}$$

Using (2.48) and (2.50) in (2.13) we obtain, after rearranging the terms

$$\begin{aligned} S(\rho|\bar\rho) &= S(\rho) - S(\bar\rho) - \big\langle \frac{\delta S}{\delta\rho}(\bar\rho), \rho-\bar\rho\big\rangle \\ &= \big(-p(\rho|\bar\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x(c-\bar c)|^2 + \tfrac{\beta}{2}(c-\bar c)^2 + <\rho-\bar\rho>(c-\bar c)\big)\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x(c-\bar c)\otimes\nabla_x(c-\bar c)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.51}$$

Using (2.49), (2.51) we express the relative energy identity (2.18) for the Euler-Poisson system,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\left(\int \Big(h(\rho|\bar\rho) - \tfrac{1}{2}(\rho-\bar\rho)\mathcal{K}*(\rho-\bar\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}\rho|u-\bar u|^2\Big)\,dx\right) \\ &\qquad = \int \operatorname{div}_x \bar u\Big(-p(\rho|\bar\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x(c-\bar c)|^2 + \tfrac{\beta}{2}(c-\bar c)^2 + <\rho-\bar\rho>(c-\bar c)\Big)\,dx \\ &\qquad\quad - \int \nabla_x\bar u : \nabla_x(c-\bar c)\otimes\nabla_x(c-\bar c)\,dx - \int \rho\nabla_x\bar u : (u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)\,dx\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.52}$$

2.6. **Order parameter approximation of the Euler-Korteweg system.** Another example of a system fitting into our framework is the following model introduced in [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\rho + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\rho u) + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u\otimes u) + \nabla_x(p(\rho) + C_\kappa\frac{\alpha}{2}\rho^2) &= C_\kappa\alpha\rho\nabla_x c \\ c - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c &= \rho\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

where C_κ is as in (2.38), and $\alpha > 0$ is a parameter. We will show in Section 5 that for $\alpha\to\infty$ classical solutions of (2.53) endowed with viscosity converge to solutions of (2.38). The motivation for introducing (5.1) in [33] was due to numerical considerations. We will comment on this briefly at the beginning of Section 5. It should be noted that similar models were derived in [4, 32] as models in their own right without reference to NSK.

In [33] the potential energy

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho, c, \nabla c) := \int \Big(h(\rho) + \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}(\rho - c)^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2 \Big)\, dx, \tag{2.54}$$

with $p(\rho) = \rho h'(\rho) - h(\rho)$ was considered. It is important to note that in this sense c is a variable which is independent of ρ and without an immediate physical interpretation. Using (2.54) we may write (2.53) as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \rho \frac{\mathrm{D}\, u}{\mathrm{D}\, t} &= -\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} \\ \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta c} &= 0\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.55}$$

However, if we understand $(2.53)_3$ not as an energy minimization condition but as the definition of c, similar to what we did in Section 2.5, we may rewrite the energy in the following way which is in the spirit of our presentation of the Euler-Poisson system:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{E}(\rho) := \int \Big(h(\rho) + \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho^2 - \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho c \Big)\, dx \\ &\text{with } c \text{ solving} \quad c - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c = \rho\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.56}$$

since $(2.53)_3$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \int \Big(\frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho^2 - \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho c \Big)\, dx &= \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2} \int \Big((\rho - c)(\rho - c) + c(\rho - c) \Big)\, dx \\ &= \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2} \int \Big((\rho - c)^2 + c(-\frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c) \Big)\, dx = \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2} \int \Big((\rho - c)^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2 \Big)\, dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

Note that $(2.56)_2$ is nearly the same as $(2.44)_2$.

In the representation (2.56) of the potential energy we may express c, if the domain is $\mathbb{R}^d$ or $\mathbb{T}^d$, using the Green's function as $c = \mathcal{G} * \rho$, where $\mathcal{G}$ is a symmetric kernel. Using the symmetry of $\mathcal{G}$ we can compute the directional derivative of $\mathcal{E}$,

$$\begin{aligned} d\mathcal{E}(\rho; \psi) &= \frac{d}{d\tau}\mathcal{E}(\rho + \tau\psi)\Big|_{\tau=0} \\ &= \int \Big(h'(\rho)\psi + C_\kappa \alpha \rho \psi - \tfrac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\psi(\mathcal{G} * \rho) - \tfrac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho(\mathcal{G} * \psi) \Big)\, dx \\ &= \int (h'(\rho) + C_\kappa \alpha \rho - C_\kappa \alpha \mathcal{G} * \rho)\psi\, dx \\ &= \big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}(\rho), \psi \big\rangle\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.58}$$

From (2.58) we obtain

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} = h'(\rho) + C_\kappa \alpha(\rho - c)\,, \tag{2.59}$$

such that we may rewrite (2.53) as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) &= 0 \\ \rho \frac{\mathrm{D}\, u}{\mathrm{D}\, t} &= -\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} \\ c - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c &= \rho\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.60}$$

In order to see that (2.53) fits into our framework it remains to show

$$-\rho \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} = \nabla_x \cdot S$$

with

$$S = \big(-p(\rho) - \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2}\rho^2 + \frac{C_\kappa \alpha}{2} c^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2)\mathbb{I} - C_\kappa \nabla_x c \otimes \nabla_x c\,. \tag{2.61}$$

This is based on the following observation:

$$\alpha\rho\nabla_x c = \alpha c \nabla_x c - \nabla_x c \Delta_x c = \nabla_x(\tfrac{1}{2}\alpha c^2) - \operatorname{div}_x\left(\nabla_x c \otimes \nabla_x c\right) + \nabla_x\big(\tfrac{1}{2}|\nabla_x c|^2\big)\,.$$

Finally, we like to point out that the potential energy (2.54) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\rho) &:= \int \Big(h(\rho) + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x c \Big)\, dx \\ &\text{with } c \text{ solving} \quad c - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c = \rho\,, \end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

since

$$\alpha \int (\rho^2 - \rho c)\, dx = \int \Big(\rho(-\Delta_x c)\Big)\, dx = \int \Big(\nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x c\Big)\, dx\,.$$

In (2.62) it is apparent that c converges to ρ, at least for sufficiently smooth ρ, and, thus, the energy of the model at hand converges to the energy of the Euler-Korteweg model. Indeed, it was shown in [34] that the energy functional of this model Γ-converges to that of the Euler-Korteweg model for $\alpha \to \infty$.

2.7. **Remarks on the Hamiltonian structure of the problem.** Here we consider the system (1.1) and briefly outline an idea, adapted from [2], on the relation of (1.1) and Hamiltonian systems. Consider the case of three space dimension, $d = 3$, and using the vector calculus formula

$$(u \cdot \nabla_x)u = \frac{1}{2}\nabla_x |u|^2 - u \times \operatorname{curl}_x u$$

rewrite (1.1) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} &= -\nabla_x \cdot (\rho u) \\ \frac{\partial u}{\partial t} &= -\nabla_x \Big(\tfrac{1}{2}|u|^2 + \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho}\Big) + u \times \operatorname{curl}_x u\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.63}$$

Define the Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}(\rho, u) = \mathcal{E}(\rho) + \hat{K}(\rho, u) = \mathcal{E}(\rho) + \int \frac{1}{2}\rho |u|^2\, dx\,. \tag{2.64}$$

Note that the kinetic energy $\hat{K}$ is viewed here as a functional on (ρ, u); this should be contrasted to (2.15). Then we easily compute the generators of the Gateaux derivatives

$$\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \rho} = \frac{\delta \mathcal{E}}{\delta \rho} + \frac{1}{2}|u|^2\,, \quad \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} = \rho u$$

and rewrite (2.63) as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\begin{pmatrix}\rho\\ u\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}0 & -\operatorname{div}_x\\ -\nabla_x & 0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \rho}\\ \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u}\end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix}0\\ \frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} \times \operatorname{curl}_x(\frac{1}{\rho}\frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u})\end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.65}$$

The operator

$$J = \begin{pmatrix}0 & -\operatorname{div}_x\\ -\nabla_x & 0\end{pmatrix}$$

is skew adjoint and the system (2.65) is Hamiltonian whenever $\operatorname{curl}_x u = 0$, but it has an additional term when $\operatorname{curl} u \neq 0$. This additional term does not affect the conservation of energy as can be seen starting from (2.65) via the following formal calculation

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}(\rho, u) &= \Big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \rho}, \rho_t \Big\rangle + \Big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u}, u_t \Big\rangle\\ &= -\Big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \rho}, \operatorname{div}_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u} \Big\rangle - \Big\langle \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta u}, \nabla_x \frac{\delta \mathcal{H}}{\delta \rho} \Big\rangle\\ &= 0\,.\end{aligned} \tag{2.66}$$

We note that the kinetic energy functional $\hat{K}(\rho, u)$ is not convex as a functional in (ρ, u), but it becomes convex when viewed as a functional in the variables (ρ, m) in (2.15).

3. Weak-strong stability for the Euler-Korteweg system

In this section we consider the Euler-Korteweg system

$$\begin{cases}\rho_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u) = 0\\ \\ (\rho u)_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho u \otimes u) = -\rho \nabla_x \Big(F_\rho(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) - \operatorname{div}_x F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \Big)\,,\end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\rho \geq 0$ is the density, u the velocity, $m = \rho u$ stands for the momentum variable, and $F(\rho, q)$ a smooth function standing for the potential energy. As noted in (2.25) we have

$$-\rho \nabla_x \big(F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x F_q \big) = \operatorname{div}_x S\,, \quad \text{where} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} S &= (F - \rho F_\rho + \rho \operatorname{div}_x F_q)\mathbb{I} - \nabla_x \rho \otimes F_q\\ &= \Big[(F - \rho F_\rho - \nabla_x \rho \cdot F_q) + \operatorname{div}_x \big(\rho F_q \big) \Big] \mathbb{I} - \nabla_x \rho \otimes F_q \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

is the stress tensor of the Korteweg fluid.

The formula (3.2) enables to express the Euler-Korteweg system in conservative form

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \operatorname{div}_x m &= 0\,,\\ \partial_t m + \operatorname{div}_x \Big(\frac{m \otimes m}{\rho} \Big) &= \operatorname{div}_x S\,, \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

where S is given by (3.3), $m = \rho u$, and to define weak solutions (see Definition 3.1 below).

3.1. **The energy identity.** We briefly review here the pointwise balance of the total (internal and kinetic) energy

$$\partial_t \left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \right) + \operatorname{div}_x \left(\frac{1}{2} m \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^2} + m\Big(F_\rho(\rho, \nabla_x\rho) - \operatorname{div}_x \big(F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \big) \Big) + F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \operatorname{div}_x m \right) = 0 \quad (3.5)$$

for smooth solutions of (3.1).

To do that, we proceed along the lines of the derivation of (2.6), (2.7) and (2.8), but proceeding now for the concrete right hand side of (3.1) and keeping track of the relevant fluxes. Indeed, a simple computation shows that the potential energy satisfies the equation

$$\partial_t F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) + \operatorname{div}_x \Big(m(F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x F_q) - F_q \rho_t \Big) = m \cdot \nabla_x (F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x F_q) \,,$$

the kinetic energy satisfies the equation

$$\partial_t (\tfrac{1}{2}\rho |u|^2) + \operatorname{div}_x \big(u \tfrac{1}{2} \rho |u|^2 \big) = -\rho u \cdot \nabla_x (F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x F_q) \,,$$

and adding the two leads to (3.5).

In the sequel we often refer to the simplest structure for a capillary fluid, arising from selecting in (2.19) the internal energy density

$$F(\rho, q) = h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|q|^2,$$

and associated to the stress tensor

$$S = \left(-p(\rho) - \frac{1}{2}\big(\rho\kappa'(\rho) - \kappa(\rho)\big)|\nabla_x \rho|^2 + \rho \operatorname{div}_x \big(\kappa(\rho) \nabla_x \rho \big) \right) \mathbb{I} - \kappa(\rho) \nabla_x \rho \otimes \nabla_x \rho \quad (3.6)$$

with $p(\rho) = \rho h'(\rho) - h(\rho)$. The energy equation (3.5) then takes the form:

$$\partial_t \left(\tfrac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + h(\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|\nabla_x \rho|^2 \right) + \operatorname{div}_x \left(\tfrac{1}{2} m \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^2} + m\Big(h'(\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}\kappa'(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho|^2 - \operatorname{div}_x(\kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho) \Big) + \kappa(\rho)\nabla_x\rho \operatorname{div}_x m \right) = 0 \,. \quad (3.7)$$

3.2. **Relative energy estimate for weak solutions.** Next, we consider the Euler-Korteweg system (3.4) and proceed to compare a weak solution (ρ, m) with a strong solution $(\bar\rho, \bar m)$ via a relative energy computation. For simplicity, we will focus on periodic solutions, defined in $\mathbb{T}^d$ the d-dimensional torus. A similar analysis can be performed for solutions in $\mathbb{R}^d$, but is omitted here. We recall:

Definition 3.1. (i) A function (ρ, m) with $\rho \in C([0,\infty); L^1(\mathbb{T}^d))$, $m \in C\big([0,\infty); \big(L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)\big)^d\big)$, $\rho \geq 0$, is a weak solution of (3.4), if $\frac{m\otimes m}{\rho}$, $S \in L^1_{loc}\big((0,\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^d)\big)^{d\times d}$, and (ρ, m) satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} -\iint \rho\psi_t + m\cdot\nabla_x\psi dx d\tau &= \int \rho(x,0)\psi(x,0)dx \,, \qquad \forall \psi \in C^1_c\left([0,\infty); C^1_p(\mathbb{T}^d)\right) ; \\ -\iint m\cdot\varphi_t + \frac{m\otimes m}{\rho} : \nabla_x\varphi - S : \nabla_x\varphi \, dxdt &= \int m(x,0)\cdot\varphi(x,0)dx \,, \\ &\qquad \forall \varphi \in C^1_c\left([0,\infty); \big(C^1_p(\mathbb{T}^d)\big)^d\right) . \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

(ii) If, in addition, $\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \in C([0,\infty); L^1(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and it satisfies

$$-\iint \left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\right) \dot{\theta}(t) \leq \int \left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\right)\Big|_{t=0} \theta(0) dx\,, \tag{3.9}$$
$$\text{for any non-negative } \theta \in W^{1,\infty}[0,\infty) \text{ compactly supported on } [0,\infty),$$

then (ρ, m) is called a dissipative weak solution.

(iii) By contrast, if $\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \in C([0,\infty); L^1(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and it satisfies (3.9) as an equality, then (ρ, m) is called a conservative weak solution.

There is no complete agreement in the scientific community about the nature of weak solutions for (3.1), that is whether one should refer to *conservative* or *dissipative* weak solutions. It appears the answer might depend on the method of construction of solutions (whether they are obtained by a limiting viscosity mechanism or arise from the nonlinear Schroedinger equation as in the case of the QHD system). In any case, here we will allow for both eventualities.

We place the following assumptions:

(H1) (ρ, m) is a dissipative (or conservative) weak periodic solution of (3.1) with $\rho \geq 0$ in the sense of Definition 3.1, and have finite total energy according to

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \rho dx \leq K_1 < \infty\,, \tag{3.10}$$

$$\sup_{t\in(0,T)} \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho} + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\, dx \leq K_2 < \infty\,, \tag{3.11}$$

(H2) $(\bar{\rho},\, \bar{u}) : (0,T) \times \mathbb{T}^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ is a strong conservative periodic solution of (3.1) with $\bar{\rho} \geq 0$ and $\bar{m} = \bar{\rho}\bar{u}$. Note that the regularity "strong" refers to the requirement that the derivatives $\frac{\partial \bar{\rho}}{\partial t}$, $\frac{\partial^2 \bar{\rho}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$, $\frac{\partial^3 \bar{\rho}}{\partial x_i \partial x_j \partial x_k}$ as well as $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial t}$, $\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j}$ and $\frac{\partial^2 \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}$ are in $L^\infty\big((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^d\big)$.

Note that for (3.11) to induce useful bounds a convexity condition is imposed on the function $F(\rho, q)$ and the associated energy. The same condition is also required for the relative energy identity to be exploited later. Instead of specifying hypotheses on F, we will assume at this stage that the weak solution enjoys the regularity

$$\rho \in C([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)) \text{ and } \nabla_x \rho \in C([0,T]; L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)) \tag{\textbf{A}}$$

and proceed to establish the relative energy identity under **(H1)**, **(H2)** and (**A**).

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that hypotheses* **(H1)**, **(H2)** *and* (**A**) *hold. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Big(\frac{1}{2}\rho\Big|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\Big|^2 + F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho|\,\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})\Big)dx\Big|_t \leq \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\Big|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\Big|^2 + F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho|\,\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})\right)dx\Big|_0 \\
&- \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \otimes \left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) : \nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) + \mathrm{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) s(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})\right] dxdt \\
&- \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) : H(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho}) + \nabla_x\,\mathrm{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) \cdot r(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})\right] dxdt\,,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
s(\rho,q) &= \rho F_\rho(\rho,q) + q\cdot F_q(\rho,q) - F(\rho,q)\ ;\\
r(\rho,q) &= \rho F_q(\rho,q)\,;\\
H(\rho,q) &= q\otimes F_q(\rho,q)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

A derivation of this formula via direct calculation valid for solutions of the Euler-Korteweg system that are *both smooth* is provided in Appendix B. Here, we relax the smoothness of one of the two solutions by using an argument that validates the formal variational calculations of Section 2 for the case of the Korteweg energy (2.19).

Proof. Let (ρ, m) be a weak dissipative (or conservative) solution and $(\bar\rho, \bar u)$ with $\bar m = \bar\rho\bar u$ a strong conservative solution. We introduce in (3.9) the choice of test function

$$
\theta(\tau) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{for } 0\le\tau<t,\\ \frac{t-\tau}{\epsilon}+1, & \text{for } t\le\tau<t+\epsilon,\\ 0, & \text{for } \tau\ge t+\epsilon, \end{cases} \tag{3.13}
$$

and let $\epsilon\downarrow 0$; we then obtain

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{|m|^2}{\rho}+F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)\right)dx\Big|_{\tau=0}^{t}\le 0\,. \tag{3.14}
$$

The same argument applied now to the strong conservative solution $(\bar\rho,\bar m)$ gives

$$
\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho}+F(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\right)dx\Big|_{\tau=0}^{t}= 0\,. \tag{3.15}
$$

Next, we justify the calculations that relate to the linear part of the relative energy, starting from the weak formulation for the equations satisfied by the differences $(\rho-\bar\rho, m-\bar m)$:

$$
-\iint_{[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\Big(\psi_t(\rho-\bar\rho)+\psi_{x_i}(m_i-\bar m_i)\Big)dxdt-\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\psi(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big|_{t=0}dx=0\,, \tag{3.16}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\iint_{[0,+\infty)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\left(\varphi_t\cdot(m-\bar m)+\partial_{x_i}\varphi_j\left(\frac{m_im_j}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m_i\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)-\partial_{x_i}\varphi_j\Big(S_{ij}-\bar S_{ij}\Big)\right)dxdt&\\
-\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\varphi(x,0)\cdot(m-\bar m)\Big|_{t=0}dx=0\,,&
\end{aligned} \tag{3.17}
$$

where φ, ψ are Lipschitz test functions compactly supported in $[0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^d$.

In the above relations we introduce the test functions

$$
\psi=\theta(\tau)\left(\bar F_\rho-\mathrm{div}_x\left(\bar F_q\right)-\frac{1}{2}\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}\right),\quad \varphi=\theta(\tau)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\,,
$$

with $\theta(\tau)$ as in (3.13). We first introduce the test function ψ above in (3.16) and let $\varepsilon \to 0$ to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \Big(\bar{F}_\rho(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar{F}_q \cdot \nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\Big|_{\tau=0}^{t} dx \\
&\quad - \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \left[\partial_\tau \left(\bar{F}_\rho - \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}\right)(\rho-\bar\rho) + \partial_\tau\big(\bar{F}_q\big)\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\right] dxd\tau \\
&\quad - \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \nabla_x \left(\bar{F}_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x\big(\bar{F}_q\big) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}\right)\cdot(m-\bar m) dxd\tau = 0\,. \qquad (3.18)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we can do that provided the weak solution $\rho(\cdot,t) \in W^{1,1}(\mathbb{T}^d)$ for each $t \in [0,\infty)$. This is the minimal regularity required to give meaning to the calculation, taking advantage of the fact that $(\bar\rho, \bar u)$ is a strong solution. Similarly, from (3.17) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot(m-\bar m)\Big|_{\tau=0}^{t} dx = \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_\tau\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot(m-\bar m) dxd\tau \\
&\quad + \iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d} \partial_{x_i}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\left(\Big(\frac{m_i m_j}{\rho} - \frac{\bar m_i \bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\Big) - (S_{ij}-\bar S_{ij})\right) dxd\tau\,. \qquad (3.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Adding (3.18) and (3.19) and using the equation

$$\partial_t \bar u + (\bar u\cdot\nabla_x)\bar u = -\nabla_x\big(\bar{F}_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x \bar{F}_q\big)$$

and the chain rule for the Lipschitz solution $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$, we obtain after some lengthy but straightforward calculations

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\Big[\bar F_\rho(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_q\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)-\frac12\frac{|\bar m|^2}{\bar\rho^2}(\rho-\bar\rho)+\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot(m-\bar m)\Big]\Big|_{\tau=0}^{t}dx\\
&=-\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\Big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot(\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\Big)dxd\tau\\
&\quad-\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\partial_{x_i}(\bar u_j)\,(S_{ij}-\bar S_{ij})dxd\tau\\
&\quad+\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\Big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x\bar F_q\Big)\cdot(\rho u-\bar\rho\bar u)dxd\tau\\
&\quad+\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\Big[\partial_\tau\Big(-\tfrac12|\bar u|^2\Big)(\rho-\bar\rho)-\nabla_x\big(\tfrac12|\bar u|^2\big)\cdot(\rho u-\bar\rho\bar u)+\partial_\tau(\bar u)\cdot(\rho u-\bar\rho\bar u)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\partial_{x_i}(\bar u_j)\,(\rho u_iu_j-\bar\rho\bar u_i\bar u_j)\Big]\,dxd\tau\\
&=-\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\Big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot(\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\qquad\qquad+\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\Big)dxd\tau\\
&\quad+\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\Big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x\bar F_q\Big)\cdot(\rho-\bar\rho)\bar u\,dxd\tau\\
&\quad-\iint_{[0,t)\times\mathbb{T}^d}\nabla_x\bar u:(S-\bar S)-\nabla_x\bar u:\rho(u-\bar u)\otimes(u-\bar u)dxd\tau\\
&=:J_1+J_2+J_3\,.
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.20}
$$

Consider next the weak form of (3.2) for the strong solution $\bar\rho$ and for φ a vector-valued test function

$$
-\int\nabla_x(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x\bar F_q)\cdot(\bar\rho\varphi)dx=\int\bar F_\rho\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)+\bar F_q\cdot\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)dx=-\int S_{ij}(\bar\rho)\frac{\partial\varphi_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx\,.
$$

We take the variational derivative of this formula along the direction of a smooth test function ψ. Using (2.22), (2.29) and recalling (2.28), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int\bar F_{\rho\rho}\psi\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)+\bar F_{q\rho}\psi\cdot\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)+\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x\psi+\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x(\bar\rho\varphi)\cdot\bar F_{qq}\nabla_x\psi\,dx\\
&-\int\nabla_x\Big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x\bar F_q\Big)\cdot(\psi\varphi)\,dx\\
&=-\int\Big[-(\bar s_\rho\psi+\bar s_q\cdot\nabla_x\psi)\delta_{ij}+\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\Big(\frac{\partial\bar r_k}{\partial\rho}\psi+\frac{\partial\bar r_k}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_l}\Big)\delta_{ij}-\Big(\frac{\partial\bar H_{ij}}{\partial\rho}\psi+\frac{\partial\bar H_{ij}}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial x_l}\Big)\Big]\frac{\partial\varphi_i}{\partial x_j}\,dx\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, set $\varphi = \bar{u}$ and $\psi = \rho - \bar{\rho}$ to obtain

$$J_1 + J_2 = \int \Big[- (\bar{s}_\rho(\rho - \bar{\rho}) + \bar{s}_q \cdot \nabla_x(\rho - \bar{\rho}))\delta_{ij} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\Big(\frac{\partial \bar{r}_k}{\partial \rho}(\rho - \bar{\rho}) + \frac{\partial \bar{r}_k}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial(\rho - \bar{\rho})}{\partial x_l}\Big)\delta_{ij} - \Big(\frac{\partial \bar{H}_{ij}}{\partial \rho}(\rho - \bar{\rho}) + \frac{\partial \bar{H}_{ij}}{\partial q_l}\frac{\partial(\rho - \bar{\rho})}{\partial x_l}\Big)\Big]\frac{\partial \bar{u}_i}{\partial x_j}\, dx\,. \tag{3.21}$$

Combining (2.23), (2.16), (3.14), (3.15), (3.20) and (3.21) and (2.30) leads to (3.12). □

Remark 3.3. In the above proof, the regularity assumption (**A**) is needed to justify the relative energy calculation in the framework of weak solutions (ρ, m). Let us also point out that formal calculations like

$$\rho \,\mathrm{div}_x\big(F_q\big) = \mathrm{div}_x\big(\rho F_q\big) - \nabla_x\rho \cdot F_q \tag{3.22}$$

(needed to justify the passage from $(3.3)_1$ to $(3.3)_2$) can be given sense in weak functional frameworks in the following standard way: if one manages to justify one side of the identity in the given framework, then one gives meaning to the other side and the product rule by using a density argument.

As an example of a possible framework, let us consider the case

$$F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho) = h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho|^2,$$

and, for the sake of simplicity, let us temporarily confine ourselves to the usual γ–law pressures, which leads to $h(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$. In this case, clearly $\big(\nabla_x\rho \cdot F_q\big)(t,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ being bounded by the energy and we are left to prove that $\big(\rho F_q\big)(t,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$. Now, for $\kappa(\rho) = const.$, or more generally if $\kappa(\rho)$ is uniformly bounded, let us assume the weak solution is continuous as a function of time with values in the appropriate spaces according to the bounded energy condition in **(H1)**:

$$\rho \in C([0,T]; L^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^d)) \text{ and } \nabla_x\rho \in C([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}^d))\,.$$

Then, $\big(\rho F_q\big)(t,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d)$ is a consequence of $\rho(t,\cdot) \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and this comes from $\rho(t,\cdot) \in L^1(\mathbb{T}^d) \cap L^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and, if $\gamma < 2$, the L^2 integrability of $\nabla_x\rho$ and the Gagliardo–Niremberg–Sobolev inequality. For the general case, clearly we need $\rho(t,\cdot)\sqrt{\kappa(\rho(t,\cdot))} \in L^2(\mathbb{T}^d)$ and the last relation is satisfied for instance if

$$\kappa(\rho) = \rho^s;\ \ s + 2 \le \gamma\,.$$

The right hand side of (3.22) is a well defined distribution, which defines in our framework also the term $\rho\,\mathrm{div}_x\big(F_q\big)$ weakly, establishing in turn the needed equality among the two terms.

Starting from (3.12), we can obtain stability estimates provided the relative potential energy $F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})$ controls from above the terms $s(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})$, $H(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})$ and $r(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho}, \nabla_x\bar{\rho})$. Keeping in mind the following framework of energies:

$$F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho) = h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho|^2, \tag{3.23}$$

in the sequel we shall perform this task in two different cases:

- $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$ constant and $h(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$ (more general functions can be also considered, provided a "γ-law behavior" is assumed; *cfr.* Lemma 3.4 and [25]); similar results in this case have been also obtained in [14];

- general energies (3.23), under appropriate assumptions on $h(\rho)$ and $\kappa(\rho)$ which lead to uniform convexity of F, and in the framework of weak solutions uniformly bounded in L^∞.

3.3. **Stability estimates for weak solutions in energy norms and constant capillarity.** In the case $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$ and for $\rho \in C([0,T]; L^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and $\nabla_x \rho \in C([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}^d))$ (see Remark 3.3), the relative internal energy is

$$F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho) = h(\rho\,|\bar\rho) + \frac{1}{2} C_\kappa |\nabla_x \rho - \nabla_x \bar\rho|^2,$$

and the quadratic remainder terms are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} H(\rho, q) &= C_\kappa q \otimes q\,; \\ s(\rho, q) &= (\gamma - 1)\rho^\gamma + C_\kappa |q|^2; \\ r(\rho, q) &= C_\kappa \rho q\,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we readily obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \big|H(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\big| = C_\kappa \big|(\nabla_x \rho - \nabla_x \bar\rho) \otimes (\nabla_x \rho - \nabla_x \bar\rho)\big| \le C F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\,; \\ s(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho) = (\gamma - 1) h(\rho\,|\bar\rho) + C_\kappa |\nabla_x \rho - \nabla_x \bar\rho|^2 \le C F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, to estimate

$$r(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho) = C_\kappa (\rho - \bar\rho)(\nabla_x \rho - \nabla_x \bar\rho)\,,$$

we recall the following result [25], clearly valid for our function $h(\rho) = \rho^\gamma$.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $h \in C^0[0, +\infty) \cap C^2(0, +\infty)$ satisfy $h''(\rho) > 0$ for $\rho > 0$ and*

$$h(\rho) = \frac{k}{\gamma - 1} \rho^\gamma + o(\rho^\gamma)\,, \quad \text{as } \rho \to +\infty \tag{3.24}$$

for some constant $k > 0$ and for $\gamma > 1$. If $\bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho} = [\delta, \bar R]$ with $\delta > 0$ and $\bar R < +\infty$, then there exist positive constants R_0 (depending on $M_{\bar\rho}$) and C_1, C_2 (depending on $M_{\bar\rho}$ and R_0) such that

$$h(\rho\,|\bar\rho) \ge \begin{cases} C_1 |\rho - \bar\rho|^2, & \text{for } 0 \le \rho \le R_0,\ \bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}\,, \\ C_2 |\rho - \bar\rho|^\gamma, & \text{for } \rho > R_0,\ \bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}\,. \end{cases} \tag{3.25}$$

With Lemma 3.4 at our hands, enlarging if necessary R_0 so that $|\rho - \bar\rho| \ge 1$ for $\rho > R_0$ and $\bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}$, we conclude $h(\rho\,|\bar\rho) \ge c_0 |\rho - \bar\rho|^2$ for any $\gamma \ge 2$, $\rho \ge 0$ and $\bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}$ and hence

$$\big|r(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\big| \le C F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho)\,.$$

Finally, the first quadratic term on the right hand side of (3.12) is clearly bounded in terms of the relative kinetic energy and therefore, denoting

$$\varphi(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d} \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho \left| \frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho} \right|^2 + F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho \,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x \bar\rho) \right) dx \Bigg|_t\,,$$

a straightforward application of the Gronwall Lemma gives the following result.

Theorem 3.5. *Let $T > 0$ be fixed and assume hypotheses* **(H1)** *and* **(H2)** *hold, and consider the energy given in* (3.23) *with $\gamma \geq 2$ and $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$ constant; in particular, $\rho \in C([0,T]; L^\gamma(\mathbb{T}^d))$ and $\nabla_x \rho \in C([0,T]; L^2(\mathbb{T}^d))$ so that assumption* (**A**) *is also verified. Moreover, assume that the smooth solution $\bar\rho$ is bounded and away from vacuum, that is $\bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}$. Then, the stability estimate*

$$\varphi(t) \leq C\varphi(0), \quad t \in [0,T]\,, \tag{3.26}$$

holds, where C is a positive constant depending only on T, $\bar\rho$ and its derivatives. In particular, if $\varphi(0) = 0$, then

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \varphi(t) = 0\,, \tag{3.27}$$

thus implying weak–strong uniqueness for the model and the framework of solutions under consideration.

Remark 3.6. It is worth to observe that the absence of vacuum for $\bar\rho$ required in the theorem above is needed solely to apply Lemma 3.4, and thus to use the term $h(\rho\,|\bar\rho)$ to control the L^2 distance between the two solutions. Hence, if we consider the special case $\gamma = 2$, for which $h(\rho\,|\bar\rho) = |\rho - \bar\rho|^2$, this extra condition is not needed anymore, and we obtain the stability estimate (3.26) even in the presence of vacuum for both solutions ρ and $\bar\rho$. However, the regularity assumption **(H2)** is still needed, requiring that $\bar u$ is well defined and smooth, and this might be inconsistent for certain models with the presence of vacuum.

3.4. **Stability estimates for L^∞ weak solutions and general capillarity.** Let us now pass to the study of energies (3.23) with non constant, smooth capillarities $\kappa(\rho)$, and smooth, nonnegative functions $h(\rho)$, that is

$$F(\rho,q) = h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|q|^2 \qquad \text{with } h(\rho) \geq 0 \text{ and } \kappa(\rho) > 0\,. \tag{3.28}$$

The assumption $\kappa(\rho) > 0$ guarantees coercivity of the energy. It is also related to the convexity of the energy.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $F(\rho,q)$ be defined by* (3.28).

(i) *If*

$$h''(\rho) > 0, \quad \kappa(\rho) > 0\,, \quad \kappa(\rho)\kappa''(\rho) - 2(\kappa'(\rho))^2 \geq 0\,, \tag{H4c}$$

then F is strictly convex for any $(\rho,q) \in \mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}^3$;

(ii) *If for some constants $\alpha_1 > 0$ and $c_\kappa > 0$,*

$$h''(\rho) \geq \alpha_1\,, \quad \kappa(\rho) \geq c_\kappa\,, \quad \kappa(\rho)\kappa''(\rho) - 2(\kappa'(\rho))^2 \geq 0\,, \tag{H4uc}$$

then F is uniformly convex.

Proof. A direct calculation shows that the Hessian matrix of $F(\rho,q)$ is given by

$$\nabla^2_{(\rho,q)} F(\rho,q) = \begin{pmatrix} h''(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa''(\rho)|q|^2 & \kappa'(\rho)q \\ \kappa'(\rho)q^T & \kappa(\rho)\mathbb{I} \end{pmatrix}$$

and its eigenvalues solve

$$\big(\kappa(\rho)-\lambda\big)^{d-1}\left[\big(\kappa(\rho)-\lambda\big)\left(h''(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa''(\rho)|q|^2 - \lambda\right) - |\kappa'(\rho)q|^2\right] = 0\,.$$

Hence $\lambda_j = \kappa(\rho)$ for $j = 1, \dots, d-1$, while λ_d and λ_{d+1} are given by

$$\lambda_\pm = \frac{1}{2}\left(\kappa(\rho) + h''(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa''(\rho)|q|^2\right) \pm \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\left(\kappa(\rho) + h''(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa''(\rho)|q|^2\right)^2 - 4\kappa(\rho)h''(\rho) - 2\big(\kappa(\rho)\kappa''(\rho) - 2|\kappa'(\rho)|^2\big)|q|^2}\,.$$

Note that λ_i are all real, and that

$$\lambda_d\lambda_{d+1} = \kappa(\rho)h''(\rho) + \tfrac{1}{2}\big(\kappa(\rho)\kappa''(\rho) - 2|\kappa'(\rho)|^2\big)|q|^2.$$

Hence, the conclusion follows. □

Remark 3.8. Note that **(H4uc)** in Lemma 3.7 is satisfied whenever we restrict in the following simple framework: the weak solution ρ is uniformly bounded, $h(\rho)$ is a uniformly convex function, while $\kappa(\rho) = \rho^s$ with $s \in [-1, 0)$. The assumptions on h and κ include the Quantum Hydrodynamics system discussed in Section 2.4.4.

We will obtain a stability estimate in terms of the following distance:

$$\Phi(t) = \int_{\mathbb{T}^d}\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right|^2 + |\rho - \bar\rho|^2 + |\nabla_x\rho - \nabla_x\bar\rho|^2\right)dx\Bigg|_t. \tag{3.29}$$

Theorem 3.9. *Consider two solutions (ρ, m) and $(\bar\rho, \bar m)$ satisfying the hypotheses* **(H1)** *and* **(H2)** *respectively for some $T > 0$ and suppose that* (3.28) *and* **(H4uc)** *hold. Furthermore, assume that ρ is uniformly bounded in L^∞, that is $0 \le \rho(x,t) \le \rho_{max}$ for a.e. (x,t), and that the strong solution $\bar\rho$ is bounded away from vacuum, that is $\bar\rho \in M_{\bar\rho}$. Then, the stability estimate*

$$\Phi(t) \le C\Phi(0), \quad t \in [0, T]\,, \tag{3.30}$$

holds, where C is a positive constant depending only on T, ρ_{max}, $\bar\rho$ and its derivatives. In particular, if $\Phi(0) = 0$, then

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\Phi(t) = 0\,, \tag{3.31}$$

which implies weak–strong uniqueness for the model and the framework of solutions under consideration.

Proof. First, we check that the framework (3.28)–**(H4uc)** and $\rho \in L^\infty$ guarantee sufficient regularity to the weak solution (ρ, m) so that (**A**) holds and the arguments used in Theorem 3.2 are valid for these energies. Since ρ is uniformly bounded in L^∞, say $0 \le \rho(x,t) \le \rho_{max}$ for a.e. (x,t), for capillarities bounded away from zero, namely $\kappa(\rho) \ge c_\kappa > 0$, the finite energy condition in **(H2)** guarantees $\nabla_x\rho \in L^2$ and that (**A**) holds. Moreover,

$$\|\kappa(\rho)\|_\infty \le \kappa_\infty = \sup_{\xi\in[0,\rho_{max}]}|\kappa(\xi)|$$

and thus $\nabla_x\rho\cdot F_q$, $\rho F_q \in L^1$ which leads also to (3.22), and the result of Theorem 3.2 is valid.

Next, thanks to Lemma 3.7, there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right|^2 + F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x\bar\rho)\right)dx\Bigg|_t \ge \alpha\Phi(t)\,,$$

where $\Phi(t)$ is given in (3.29).

Hence, we need to bound the right hand side of the (weak form of the) relative energy relation (3.12) in terms of $\Phi(t)$. To this end, we recall that

$$\begin{aligned} H(\rho,q) &= \kappa(\rho) q\otimes q\,;\\ h(\rho,q) &= \rho h'(\rho) - h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}(\rho\kappa'(\rho)+\kappa(\rho))|q|^2 = \widehat{h}(\rho) + \widehat{\kappa}(\rho)|q|^2;\\ r(\rho,q) &= \rho\kappa(\rho) q = \widetilde{\kappa}(\rho) q\,. \end{aligned}$$

A direct calculation then shows

$$\begin{aligned} H(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) &= \kappa(\rho\,|\bar\rho)\nabla_x\bar\rho\otimes\nabla_x\bar\rho + \kappa(\rho)\Big(\nabla_x\rho\otimes\nabla_x\rho - \nabla_x\bar\rho\otimes\nabla_x\bar\rho\Big)\\ &\quad - \kappa(\bar\rho)\Big(\nabla_x\bar\rho\otimes(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho) + (\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\otimes\nabla_x\bar\rho\Big)\\ &= \kappa(\rho\,|\bar\rho)\nabla_x\bar\rho\otimes\nabla_x\bar\rho + \kappa(\rho)(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\otimes(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\\ &\quad + \Big(\kappa(\rho)-\kappa(\bar\rho)\Big)\Big(\nabla_x\bar\rho\otimes(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho) + (\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\otimes\nabla_x\bar\rho\Big)\,;\\ s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) &= \widehat{h}(\rho\,|\bar\rho) + \widehat{\kappa}(\rho\,|\bar\rho)|\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2 + \widehat{\kappa}(\rho)\big(|\nabla_x\rho|^2 - |\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2\big)\\ &\quad - 2\widehat{\kappa}(\bar\rho)\nabla_x\bar\rho\cdot(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\\ &= \widehat{h}(\rho\,|\bar\rho) + \widehat{\kappa}(\rho\,|\bar\rho)|\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2 + \widehat{\kappa}(\rho)|\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2\\ &\quad + 2\big(\widehat{\kappa}(\rho)-\widehat{\kappa}(\bar\rho)\big)\nabla_x\bar\rho\cdot(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,;\\ r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) &= \widetilde{\kappa}(\rho\,|\bar\rho)\nabla_x\bar\rho + \big(\widetilde{\kappa}(\rho)-\widetilde{\kappa}(\bar\rho)\big)(\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we can estimate the quadratic terms on the right hand side of (3.12) in terms of the differences $|\rho-\bar\rho|^2$ and $|\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2$:

$$\big|H(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\big|,\ |s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)|,\ \big|r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\big| \le C|\rho-\bar\rho|^2 + C|\nabla_x\rho-\nabla_x\bar\rho|^2,$$

where the constant C depends solely on the smooth functions h and κ, the uniform bounds of ρ, that is ρ_{max}, and $\bar\rho$ and its derivatives. Finally, as in the previous framework, the right hand side of (3.12) is bounded in terms of Φ and thus the Gronwall Lemma gives the desired result. □

4. Stability estimates for non-convex energies

In this section we study the model (3.1) on $(0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3$ in case the local part $h(\rho)$ of the internal energy is non-convex. Subsequently, we assume $h\in C^3((0,\infty),[0,\infty))$, but no convexity of h. We will see that the higher order terms compensate for the non-convex h, in the sense that we are still able to use (a modified version of) the relative energy to obtain continuous dependence on initial data. To simplify the analysis we restrict ourselves to the case that $\kappa(\rho)=C_\kappa>0$. We are convinced that analogous results also hold for ρ dependent capillarity in case K is bounded from above and below.

4.1. **Assumptions.**

We are not (yet) able to carry out the subsequent analysis for weak solutions and, thus, we will consider strong solutions of (3.1) with $\kappa(\rho)=C_\kappa$ in the spaces

$$\begin{aligned} &\rho\in C^0([0,T],C^3(\mathbb{T}^3,\mathbb{R}_+))\cap C^{\frac{3}{2}}((0,T),C^0(\mathbb{T}^3,\mathbb{R}_+))\,,\\ &u\in C^0([0,T],C^1(\mathbb{T}^3,\mathbb{R}^3))\cap C^1((0,T),C^0(\mathbb{T}^3,\mathbb{R}^3))\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

We will compare solutions (ρ,u) and $(\bar\rho,\bar u)$ corresponding to initial data (ρ_0,u_0) and $(\bar\rho_0,\bar u_0)$, respectively, by relative energy.

To this end, we need to assume some uniform bounds. In particular, vacuum has to be avoided uniformly.

Assumption 4.1 (Uniform bounds)**.** *We assume that there are constants $C_\rho, c_\rho, c_m > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} c_\rho \le \rho(t,x), \bar\rho(t,x) \le C_\rho \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T],\, x \in \mathbb{T}^3, \\ c_m \ge \max\left\{ \|m\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)}, \|\bar m\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)} \right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

and define the following constants: $p_M := \|p(\rho)\|_{C^2([c_\rho, C_\rho])}$, $h_M := \|h(\rho)\|_{C^3([c_\rho,C_\rho])}$.

4.2. **Continuous dependence on initial data.** Let us state the particular form of the relative energy and relative energy flux between solutions (ρ, m) and $(\bar\rho, \bar m)$ of (3.1) with the choice $F(\rho, q) = h(\rho) + C_\kappa |q|^2$. For notational convenience, we omit capillarity related contributions in the relative energy flux:

$$\begin{aligned} \eta\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) &= h(\rho) - h(\bar\rho) - h'(\bar\rho)(\rho - \bar\rho) + \frac{C_\kappa}{2} |\nabla_x(\rho - \bar\rho)|^2 + \frac{\rho}{2}|u - \bar u|^2, \\ q\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) &= mh'(\rho) + \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2} m - mh'(\bar\rho) + \frac{|\bar m|^2}{2\bar\rho^2}\bar m - \frac{\bar m \cdot m}{\bar\rho\rho} m + \frac{p(\rho)}{\bar\rho}\bar m - \frac{p(\bar\rho)}{\bar\rho}\bar m\,. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

The main challenge we are faced with in this chapter is the non-convexity of h which ensues that the relative energy is not suitable for measuring the distance between solutions. However, if h vanished, the relative energy would be suitable for controlling the difference between solutions. To be more precise, the relative kinetic energy allows us to control $u - \bar u$ and $\int |\nabla_x(\rho - \bar\rho)|^2$ is equivalent to the squared H^1 distance between ρ and $\bar\rho$ provided $\rho, \bar\rho$ have the same mean value, due to Poincaré's inequality. We restrict ourselves to the case

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\rho_0 - \bar\rho_0)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = 0 \tag{4.4}$$

such that Poincaré's inequality is applicable. Therefore, we like to introduce the following quantity, which is part of the relative energy:

$$\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) := \frac{C_\kappa}{2} |\nabla_x(\rho - \bar\rho)|^2 + k(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m)\,, \tag{4.5}$$

where $k(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m)$ is the density of the relative kinetic energy $K(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m)$ introduced in (2.16). We call η_{R} the *reduced relative energy*.

Due to the properties of the relative kinetic energy we obtain two estimates for the reduced relative energy

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) &\ge \frac{C_\kappa}{2}|\bar\rho - \rho|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{c_\rho}{2}\|u - \bar u\|_{L^2}^2, \\ \eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) &\ge \frac{C_\kappa}{4}|\bar\rho - \rho|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{C_\kappa c_\rho^2}{8 C_P c_m^2}\|\bar m - m\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $|\cdot|_{H^1}$ denotes the H^1-semi-norm, i.e., $|\rho|_{H^1} := |\nabla_x \rho|_{L^2}$, and C_P is the Poincaré constant on $\mathbb{T}^3$.

Based on the relative energy and the relative energy flux we can make the computations for the general case, given in (2.31), more specific:

Lemma 4.2 (Rate of the relative energy)**.** *Let $T > 0$ be given and let (ρ, m) and $(\bar\rho, \bar m)$ be strong solutions of (3.1), with $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa > 0$, corresponding to initial data (ρ_0, m_0) and*

$(\bar\rho_0, \bar m_0)$, *respectively. Let* (4.2) *and* (4.4) *hold. Then, the rate (of change) of the relative energy defined in* (4.3) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\sum_{i=1}^{4} A_i\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,, \tag{4.7}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &:= -C_\kappa\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot(\bar\rho-\rho)\Big(\nabla_x\Delta_x(\bar\rho-\rho)\Big)\,,\\
A_2 &:= \frac{\nabla_x\bar\rho}{\bar\rho}\otimes\bar u : \Big((\bar u-u)\otimes(\rho\bar u-\rho u)+\frac{1}{3}\mathbb{I}\big(p(\rho)-p(\bar\rho)-p'(\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\Big)\,,\\
A_3 &:= \frac{1}{\bar\rho}\nabla_x\bar m : (\rho u-\rho\bar u)\otimes(\bar u-u)\,,\\
A_4 &:= -\frac{\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)}{\bar\rho}\big(p(\rho)-p(\bar\rho)-p'(\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Next, we determine the rate of the reduced relative energy based on Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3 (Rate of the reduced relative energy)**.** *Let the assumptions of Lemma 4.2 be satisfied. Then, the rate of the reduced relative energy defined in* (4.5) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\sum_{i=1}^{6} A_i\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,, \tag{4.9}$$

where $A_1,\dots,A_4$ *are as in Lemma 4.2 and*

$$\begin{aligned}
A_5 &:= \mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)\big(h'(\rho)-h'(\bar\rho)-h''(\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\,,\\
A_6 &:= \big(h'(\rho)-h'(\bar\rho)\big)\big(\mathrm{div}_x(m)-\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)\big)\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.10}$$

Proof. By definition it holds

$$(\eta_{\mathrm{R}}-\eta)\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big) = -h(\rho)+h(\bar\rho)+h'(\bar\rho)(\rho-\bar\rho) = -\int_{\bar\rho}^{\rho}(\rho-s)h''(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\,. \tag{4.11}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\eta_{\mathrm{R}}-\eta)\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big) =& \bar\rho_t(\rho-\bar\rho)h''(\bar\rho) - \int_{\bar\rho}^{\rho}\rho_t h''(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
=& -\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)h''(\bar\rho) + \mathrm{div}_x(m)\int_{\bar\rho}^{\rho}h''(s)\,\mathrm{d}\,s\\
=& -\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)(\rho-\bar\rho)h''(\bar\rho) + \mathrm{div}_x(m)(h'(\rho)-h'(\bar\rho))\\
=& \,\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)(h'(\rho)-h'(\bar\rho)-(\rho-\bar\rho)h''(\bar\rho))\\
&+(h'(\rho)-h'(\bar\rho))(\mathrm{div}_x(m)-\mathrm{div}_x(\bar m)) = A_5+A_6.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

The assertion of the lemma follows upon combining (4.12) and Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.4 (Estimate of the reduced relative energy rate)**.** *Let the assumptions of Lemma 4.2 be fulfilled and let the initial data* $\rho_0, \bar\rho_0$ *satisfy* (4.4)*. Then, there exists a constant* $C>0$ *depending only on* $T, C_\kappa, \bar\rho_0, \bar u_0, c_\rho, C_\rho, c_m$ *such that the rate of change of the reduced relative energy fulfills*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le C\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho,\bar m\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. The proof is based on Lemma 4.3 and estimates of the A_i. In order to keep the notation manageable we suppress the t dependency of all quantities in the proof. For example $\|u\|_{C^2}$ refers to $\|u\|_{C^0([0,T],C^2(\mathbb{T}^3))}$ which is bounded and depends on ρ_0, m_0, T, C_κ, only. Let us estimate the A_i one by one: For A_1 we conclude using (2.26) and integration by parts

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_1 \,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} -C_\kappa \bar{u}\cdot(\nabla_x\Delta_x\bar{\rho}-\nabla_x\Delta_x\rho)(\bar{\rho}-\rho)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} C_\kappa\bar{u}\cdot\operatorname{div}_x\Big(\Big((\rho-\bar{\rho})\Delta_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)-\frac{|\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)|^2}{2}\Big)\mathbb{I}+\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)\otimes\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
=&C_\kappa\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\operatorname{div}_x(\bar{u})\Big((\bar{\rho}-\rho)\Delta_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)+\frac{|\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)|^2}{2}\Big)-\nabla_x u:\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)\otimes\nabla_x(\bar{\rho}-\rho)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
\le&C_\kappa\,\|\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x(\bar{u})\|_{L^\infty}\,C_P\,|\bar{\rho}-\rho|_{H^1}^2+\frac{3C_\kappa}{2}\,\|\nabla_x\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}\,|\bar{\rho}-\rho|_{H^1}^2\\
\le&5\,\|\bar{u}\|_{C^2}\,C_P\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho,m|\bar{\rho},\bar{m}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.14}$$

The summand A_2 can be estimated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_2\,\mathrm{d}\, x=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\frac{\nabla_x\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\rho}}\otimes\bar{u}:(\bar{u}-u)\otimes(\rho\bar{u}-\rho u)+\frac{1}{3}\frac{\nabla_x\bar{\rho}}{\bar{\rho}}\cdot\bar{u}(p(\rho)-p(\bar{\rho})-p'(\bar{\rho})(\rho-\bar{\rho}))\,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
\le&\frac{\|\nabla_x\bar{\rho}\otimes\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}}{c_\rho}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\rho|\bar{u}-u|^2\,\mathrm{d}\, x+p_M\,\|\rho-\bar{\rho}\|_{L^2}^2\Big)\\
\le&\frac{\|\nabla_x\bar{\rho}\|_{L^\infty}\,\|\bar{u}\|_{L^\infty}}{c_\rho}\frac{4p_MC_P}{C_\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho,m|\bar{\rho},\bar{m}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.15}$$

Concerning A_3 we find

$$A_3=\frac{\rho}{\bar{\rho}}\nabla_x\bar{m}:(u-\bar{u})\otimes(\bar{u}-u)$$

such that

$$\Big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_3\,\mathrm{d}\, x\Big|\le 2\left\|\frac{\nabla_x\bar{m}}{c_\rho}\right\|_{L^\infty}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho,m|\bar{\rho},\bar{m}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,.\tag{4.16}$$

The estimates for A_4 and A_5 are straightforward, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_4\,\mathrm{d}\, x\Big|&\le\frac{1}{c_\rho}\,\|\operatorname{div}_x\bar{m}\|_{L^\infty}\,p_M\frac{C_P}{C_\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho,m|\bar{\rho},\bar{m}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,,\\
\Big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_5\,\mathrm{d}\, x\Big|&\le\|\operatorname{div}_x\bar{m}\|_{L^\infty}\,h_M\frac{C_P}{C_\kappa}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho,m|\bar{\rho},\bar{m}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.17}$$

Using integration by parts we find for A_6

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_6\,\mathrm{d}\, x=\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\big(h''(\bar{\rho})\nabla_x\bar{\rho}-h''(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\big)\cdot\big(m-\bar{m}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\\
=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\big(h''(\bar{\rho})\nabla_x\bar{\rho}-h''(\rho)\nabla_x\bar{\rho}\big)\cdot\big(m-\bar{m}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x+\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\big(h''(\rho)\nabla_x\bar{\rho}-h''(\rho)\nabla_x\rho\big)\cdot\big(m-\bar{m}\big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x
\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

such that

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_6 \,\mathrm{d}\, x\Big| \leq h_M \,\|\bar\rho\|_{C^1} \,\|\bar\rho - \rho\|_{L^2} \,\|m - \bar m\|_{L^2} + h_M \,|\bar\rho - \rho|_{H^1} \,\|m - \bar m\|_{L^2}\,, \tag{4.19}$$

which implies

$$\Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_6 \,\mathrm{d}\, x\Big| \leq h_M(\|\bar\rho\|_{C^1} + 1)\frac{C_P c_m^2}{8c_\rho^2 C_\kappa} \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho, m|\bar\rho, \bar m\Big) \,\mathrm{d}\, x\,, \tag{4.20}$$

due to (4.6). The assertion of the Lemma follows upon combining (4.14), (4.15), (4.16), (4.17), and (4.20). □

Now we are in position to state and prove the main result of this section: strong solutions to (3.1) with $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa$ depend continuously on their initial data, provided they satisfy the uniform bounds (4.2).

Theorem 4.5 (Stability)**.** *Let $T, C_\kappa > 0$ be given and let (ρ, u) and $(\bar\rho, \bar u)$ be strong solutions of (3.1), with $\kappa(\rho) = C_\kappa > 0$, corresponding to initial data (ρ_0, u_0) and $(\bar\rho_0, \bar u_0)$, respectively. Let (4.2) and (4.4) hold. Then, there exists a constant $C = C(T, C_\kappa, \bar\rho_0, \bar u_0, c_\rho, C_\rho, c_m) > 0$ such that the following estimate is satisfied*

$$\frac{C_\kappa}{2}\|\rho - \bar\rho\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{T}^3))} + \frac{c_\rho}{2}\,\|u - \bar u\|^2_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))} \leq C\eta_{\mathrm{R}}\Big(\rho_0, m_0|\bar\rho_0, \bar m_0\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\, x\,. \tag{4.21}$$

Proof. The assertion of the theorem follows by applying Gronwall's Lemma to (4.13) and combining the result with $(4.6)_1$. □

Remark 4.6 (Viscosity)**.** Note that we could also add viscous terms into (3.1) such that we obtained (2.38). The arguments presented here can be extended easily to that case. In the case with viscosity the results from [23] guarantee the existence of strong solutions for short times.

Remark 4.7 (Capillarity)**.** The constant C in Theorem 4.5 depends on C_κ like $\exp(1/C_\kappa)$ at best, as can be seen from the estimates of the A_i in the proof of Lemma 4.4. In particular, the constant blows up for $C_\kappa \to 0$.

5. Model convergence

In this section we employ the relative energy framework to show that the isothermal Navier-Stokes-Korteweg model (2.38) is indeed approximated by the lower order model introduced in [33], which is given in (1.14). Note that (2.38) is the model investigated in the previous section plus viscosity. Before we present our analysis let us digress a bit in order to justify our interest in the relation between the two models. Numerical schemes for the isothermal NSK system (2.38) have been considered by several authors, see [20, 5, 35] and references therein. In these works the main effort was directed at overcoming stability issues, which are mainly caused by the non-convexity of the energy. Several of the approaches for constructing numerical schemes were based on Runge-Kutta-discontinuous Galerkin type discretizations. However, the number of numerical flux functions which may be used is severely restricted by the non-hyperbolicity of the first order part of (2.38) which is caused by h being non-convex.

Moreover, discrete energy inequalities for explicit-in-time schemes cannot be proven by standard arguments from hyperbolic theory. Indeed, a non-monotone behavior of the energy

is observed in numerical experiments. To overcome these problems the following family of approximations, parametrized in $\alpha > 0$, of the NSK system was introduced in [33]:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^\alpha_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho^\alpha u^\alpha) &= 0 \\ (\rho^\alpha u^\alpha)_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho^\alpha u^\alpha \otimes u^\alpha) + \nabla_x(p(\rho^\alpha) + C_\kappa \frac{\alpha}{2}(\rho^\alpha)^2) &= \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) + C_\kappa \alpha \rho^\alpha \nabla_x c^\alpha \\ c^\alpha - \frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x c^\alpha &= \rho^\alpha, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

where c^α is an auxiliary variable without any immediate physical interpretation. It is a striking feature of (5.1) that the first order part of $(5.1)_{1,2}$ forms a hyperbolic system for ρ^α, m^α, provided α is sufficiently large. Numerical studies showing that (5.1) offers numerical advantages over (2.38) and that solutions of (5.1) are similar to those of (2.38) can be found in [29]. In particular, examples are presented in [29] which show that explicit-in-time schemes for (5.1) have far better stability properties than explicit-in-time schemes for (2.38). Variational problems related to minima of the energy functional of (5.1), see Lemma 5.6, were investigated in [4, 34]. Based on formal arguments it was conjectured in [33] that for $\alpha \to \infty$ solutions of (5.1) converge to solutions of (2.38). Results in this direction were obtained in [8] using Fourier methods and for similar models describing elastic solids in [16, 19]. The result in [16] is obtained using compactness arguments, while [19] is based on a (technically simpler) version of the arguments presented here. The main result of this section, Theorem 5.14, is an estimate for the difference between solutions of (5.1) and (2.38).

5.1. **Assumptions on well-posedness and uniform bounds.** We complement (2.38), (5.1) with initial data

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(0,\cdot) = \rho_0, \quad u(0,\cdot) = u_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^3, \\ \rho^\alpha(0,\cdot) = \rho^\alpha_0, \quad u^\alpha(0,\cdot) = u^\alpha_0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{T}^3, \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

for given data $\rho^\alpha_0, \rho_0 \in C^3(\mathbb{T}^3, (0,\infty))$ and $u^\alpha_0, u_0 \in C^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)$ which we assume to be related as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\rho^\alpha_0 - \rho_0)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = 0, \quad \|\rho^\alpha_0 - \rho_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)} = \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1/2}), \\ &\|\rho^\alpha_0\|_{H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)} = \mathcal{O}(1), \quad \|u^\alpha_0 - u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} = \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1/2}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Concerning the viscous part of the stress we will require that there is bulk viscosity, i.e.,

$$\lambda + \frac{2}{3}\mu > 0. \tag{5.4}$$

The well-posedness of (5.1) was studied in [33] for two space dimensions on the whole of $\mathbb{R}^2$. We will assume (local-in-time) existence of strong solutions to (5.1) and (2.38) posed on $\mathbb{T}^3$. In particular:

Assumption 5.1 (Regularity)**.** *We assume that there is some $T > 0$ such that strong solutions of* (5.1) *and* (2.38) *exist and satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho &\in C^0([0,T], C^3(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+)) \cap C^1((0,T), C^1(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+))\,,\\
u &\in C^0([0,T], C^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1((0,T), C^0(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))\,,\\
\rho^\alpha &\in C^0([0,T], C^1(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+)) \cap C^1((0,T), C^0(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+))\,,\\
u^\alpha &\in C^0([0,T], C^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3)) \cap C^1((0,T), C^0(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}^3))\,,\\
c^\alpha &\in C^0([0,T], C^3(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+)) \cap C^1((0,T), C^2(\mathbb{T}^3, \mathbb{R}_+))\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Remark 5.2 (Regularity)**.** Note that the regularity assumed in (5.5) coincides with the regularity asserted in [33] and [23], for T small enough. Therefore, for appropriate T, the only assumptions made here are that the change from natural to periodic boundary conditions does not deteriorate the regularity of solutions and that the time of existence of solutions of (5.1) does not go to zero for $\alpha \to \infty$. The existence of a space derivative of ρ_t follows from the mass conservation equation and the regularity of ρ, u.

Assumption 5.3 (Uniform bounds)**.** *We assume that there are constants $\alpha_0, C_\rho, c_\rho, c_m > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&c_\rho \le \rho(t,x), \rho^\alpha(t,x) \le C_\rho \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T],\, x \in \mathbb{T}^3,\, \alpha > \alpha_0\,,\\
&c_m \ge \sup\{\|m^\alpha\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)}\,,\, \|m\|_{L^\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{T}^3)}\}\,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Remark 5.4 (Uniform a-priori estimates)**.** The crucial assumption in (5.6) is that these estimates hold uniformly in α, while analogous estimates for fixed α are immediate for sufficiently small times and appropriate initial data. We are not aware that there is any mechanism in (5.1) which makes (5.6) unlikely to hold. While it would be desirable to prove (5.6), this is beyond the scope of this work.

Remark 5.5 (A-priori estimate on c^α)**.** Note that the maximum principle applied to the screened Poisson equation $(5.1)_3$ immediately implies

$$c_\rho \le c^\alpha(t,x) \le C_\rho \quad \forall\, t \in [0,T],\, x \in \mathbb{T}^3,\, \alpha > \alpha_0\,,$$

once we assume (5.6).

Note that, using $(5.1)_3$, $(5.1)_2$ can be rewritten as

$$(\rho^\alpha u^\alpha)_t + \operatorname{div}_x(\rho^\alpha u^\alpha \otimes u^\alpha) + \nabla_x p(\rho^\alpha) = \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) + C_\kappa \rho^\alpha \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha. \tag{5.7}$$

Moreover, (5.1) conserves momentum as can be seen from (2.61).

As already noted in [33], solutions of (5.1) satisfy an energy inequality. In order to keep this paper self contained we state the energy inequality and sketch its proof.

Lemma 5.6 (Energy balance for (5.1))**.** *Let $(\rho^\alpha, u^\alpha, c^\alpha)$ be a strong solution of* (5.1)*. Then, the following energy balance law is satisfied:*

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \ge -\sigma[u^\alpha] : \nabla_x u^\alpha &= \big(h(\rho^\alpha) + \frac{\rho}{2}\,|u^\alpha|^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\nabla_x c^\alpha|^2 + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha|^2\,\big)_t\\
+ \operatorname{div}_x\big(u^\alpha\big(\rho^\alpha h'(\rho^\alpha) &+ \frac{1}{2}\rho^\alpha\,|u^\alpha|^2 - C_\kappa \rho^\alpha \Delta_x c^\alpha\big) - C_\kappa c_t^\alpha \nabla_x c^\alpha + C_\kappa \rho^\alpha \nabla_x \rho^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x u^\alpha - \sigma[u^\alpha] u^\alpha\big)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

and

$$\|\mathrm{div}_x\, u^\alpha\|^2_{L^2([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^3)} \le \frac{1}{\lambda+\frac{2}{3}\mu}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} h(\rho_0^\alpha) + \frac{\rho_0^\alpha}{2}\,|u_0^\alpha|^2 + \frac{C_\kappa\alpha}{2}\,|\rho_0^\alpha - c_0^\alpha|^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|c_0^\alpha|^2\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,. \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. Equation $(5.1)_1$ is multiplied by $h'(\rho^\alpha)-\frac{1}{2}|u^\alpha|^2+\alpha C_\kappa(\rho^\alpha-c^\alpha)$ and $(5.1)_2$ is multiplied by u^α. Then, both equations are added and integration by parts is used. The first assertion of the lemma follows upon noting that

$$\nabla_x c^\alpha\cdot\nabla_x c_t^\alpha - \alpha C_\kappa c_t^\alpha(\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha) - \mathrm{div}_x(C_\kappa c_t^\alpha\nabla_x c^\alpha) = 0\,.$$

The second assertion of the lemma is a result of the first assertion and the identity

$$\sigma[u]:\nabla_x u = (\lambda+\frac{2}{3}\mu)(\mathrm{div}_x\, u)^2 + 2\mu\nabla_x^o u:\nabla_x^o u \ge 0\,, \quad (5.10)$$

where ∇_x^o denotes the trace free part of the Jacobian. □

5.2. **Elliptic approximation.** In this section we study properties of the screened Poisson operator in $(5.1)_3$. To quantify the approximation of ρ^α by c^α we recall the following result from [19]. The solution operator to $\mathrm{Id}-\frac{1}{\alpha}\Delta_x$ on $\mathbb{T}^3$ is denoted by G_α :

Lemma 5.7 (Elliptic approximation, [19])**.** *The operator G_α has the following properties:*

(a) *For any $f\in L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ the following estimate is fulfilled*

$$\|G_\alpha[f]\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \le \|f\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\,. \quad (5.11)$$

(b) *For any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $f\in H^k(\mathbb{T}^3)$ it is $G_\alpha[f]\in H^{k+2}(\mathbb{T}^3)$.*

(c) *For all $f\in H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)$ the following holds:*

$$G_\alpha[f_x] = (G_\alpha[f])_x \quad \text{and} \quad \|f-G_\alpha[f]\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \le \frac{2}{\alpha}|f|^2_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}\,. \quad (5.12)$$

(d) *In case $f\in H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ the following (stronger) estimate is satisfied:*

$$\|f-G_\alpha[f]\|^2_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)} \le \frac{1}{\alpha^2}|f|^2_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\,.$$

Remark 5.8. As $\|\rho_0^\alpha\|_{H^1}$ is bounded by (5.3), assertion (c) of Lemma 5.7 implies that the initial energy of the lower order model is bounded independent of α. Due to (5.9) this implies that $\|\mathrm{div}_x\, u^\alpha\|_{L^2([0,T]\times\mathbb{T}^3)}$ is bounded independent of α.

5.3. **Relative energy.** In this section we study the relative energy and relative energy flux between a solution (ρ,u) of (2.38) and a solution $(\rho^\alpha,u^\alpha,c^\alpha)$ of (5.1). They are based on the energies and energy fluxes of the systems (5.1) and (2.38) determined in Lemmas 3.15 and 5.6, but we omit the higher order terms, i.e., those depending on C_κ, in the relative energy flux:

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta^\alpha &:= h(\rho^\alpha) + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\nabla_x c^\alpha|^2 + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha|^2 - h(\rho) - \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\nabla_x\rho|^2\\
&\quad - h'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha-\rho) - C_\kappa\nabla_x\rho\cdot\nabla_x(c^\alpha-\rho) + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{2}|u-u^\alpha|^2,\\
q^\alpha &:= m^\alpha h'(\rho^\alpha) + \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{2(\rho^\alpha)^2}m^\alpha - mh'(\rho) - \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2}m - h'(\rho)(m^\alpha-m)\\
&\quad + \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2}(m^\alpha-m) - \frac{m}{\rho}\cdot\Big(\frac{m^\alpha\otimes m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} + p(\rho^\alpha) - \frac{m\otimes m}{\rho} - p(\rho)\Big)\,.
\end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Several terms in (5.13) cancel out, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^\alpha &= h(\rho^\alpha) - h(\rho) - h'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha - \rho) + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\nabla_x(c^\alpha - \rho)|^2 + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha|^2 + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{2}|u - u^\alpha|^2,\\ q^\alpha &= m^\alpha h'(\rho^\alpha) + \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{2(\rho^\alpha)^2}m^\alpha - m^\alpha h'(\rho) + \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2}m - \frac{m\cdot m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha\rho}m^\alpha - \frac{p(\rho^\alpha)}{\rho}m + \frac{p(\rho)}{\rho}m\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

As in Section 4, the relative energy is not suitable for measuring the distance between solutions and, again, we introduce the *reduced relative energy* and the *relative kinetic energy*:

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^\alpha_{\mathrm{R}} &:= \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\nabla_x c^\alpha - \nabla_x\rho|^2 + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha|^2 + K^\alpha,\\ K^\alpha &:= \frac{\rho^\alpha}{2}|u - u^\alpha|^2.\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

Note that calculations analogous to the derivation of (4.6) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta^\alpha_{\mathrm{R}}\,\mathrm{d}\,x &\geq \frac{C_\kappa}{2}|c^\alpha - \rho|^2_{H^1} + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,\|c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{2}\|u - u^\alpha\|^2_{L^2}\,,\\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta^\alpha_{\mathrm{R}}\,\mathrm{d}\,x &\geq \frac{C_\kappa}{4}|c^\alpha - \rho|^2_{H^1} + \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{4}\,\|c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha\|^2_{L^2} + \frac{C_\kappa c_\rho^2}{8C_P c_m^2}\|m - m^\alpha\|^2_{L^2}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Based on the relative energy and the relative energy flux we can show the following estimate whose proof is based on the same principles as the derivation of (B.10). However, an additional difficulty is presented by the fact that the functions which are compared solve different PDEs.

Lemma 5.9 (Rate of the relative energy)**.** *Let $T > 0$ be given such that there are strong solutions (ρ, u) and $(\rho^\alpha, u^\alpha, c^\alpha)$ of* (2.38) *and* (5.1)*, respectively, satisfying* (5.5) *and* (5.6)*. Then, the rate (of change) of the relative energy η^α defined in* (5.13) *fulfills*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\,x = \int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\sum_{i=1}^{6}A_i^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,, \tag{5.17}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}A_1^\alpha &:= \frac{\mathrm{div}_x\,\sigma[u]}{\rho}\cdot(u - u^\alpha)(\rho^\alpha - \rho) + (u - u^\alpha)\cdot(\mathrm{div}_x\,\sigma[u] - \mathrm{div}_x\,\sigma[u^\alpha])\,,\\ A_2^\alpha &:= -C_\kappa\frac{m}{\rho}\cdot\nabla_x\Delta_x(\rho - c^\alpha)(\rho - \rho^\alpha)\,,\\ A_3^\alpha &:= \frac{\nabla_x\rho}{\rho}\otimes u : \Big((u - u^\alpha)\otimes(\rho^\alpha u - \rho^\alpha u^\alpha) + \frac{1}{3}\mathbb{I}\big(p(\rho^\alpha) - p(\rho) - p'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha - \rho)\big)\Big)\,,\\ A_4^\alpha &:= \frac{1}{\rho}\nabla_x m : (\rho^\alpha u^\alpha - \rho^\alpha u)\otimes(u - u^\alpha)\,,\\ A_5^\alpha &:= -\frac{\mathrm{div}_x(m)}{\rho}\big(p(\rho^\alpha) - p(\rho) - p'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha - \rho)\big)\,,\\ A_6^\alpha &:= C_\kappa(\rho_t^\alpha - c_t^\alpha)\Delta_x\rho\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

The proof of this Lemma is given in Appendix C.

Remark 5.10. Note that all but two of the A_i^α in Lemma 5.9 correspond to terms in Lemma 4.2. The term A_1^α is due to viscosity and A_6^α is due to the different regularizations. These are the only terms having no counterparts in Lemma 4.2.

Our next step is to derive a representation of the rate of the reduced relative energy from Lemma 5.9.

Lemma 5.11 (Rate of the reduced relative energy)**.** *Let the assumptions of Lemma 5.9 be satisfied. Then, the rate of the reduced relative energy $\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^{\alpha}$ defined in* (5.15) *satisfies*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,x=\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\sum_{i=1}^{8}A_i^{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,, \tag{5.19}$$

where $A_1,\dots,A_6$ are as in Lemma 5.9 and

$$\begin{aligned}A_7^{\alpha}&:=\operatorname{div}_x(m)\big(h'(\rho^{\alpha})-h'(\rho)-h''(\rho)(\rho^{\alpha}-\rho)\big)\,,\\ A_8^{\alpha}&:=\big(h'(\rho^{\alpha})-h'(\rho)\big)\big(\operatorname{div}_x(m^{\alpha})-\operatorname{div}_x(m)\big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.20}$$

The proof of Lemma 5.11 is analogous to the proof of Lemma 4.3.

Lemma 5.12 (Estimate of the reduced relative energy rate)**.** *Let the assumptions of Lemma 5.9 be satisfied. Then, there exist a constant $C>0$ and a function $E\in L^1(0,T)$, both independent of $\alpha>\alpha_0$, such that the rate (of change) of the reduced relative energy satisfies the following estimate*

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\,t}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,x\le C\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,x+\frac{E}{\alpha}\,. \tag{5.21}$$

Proof. The proof is based on Lemma 5.11 and estimates of the A_i^{α}. For brevity we suppress the t dependency of all quantities in the proof. The terms A_3^{α}, A_4^{α}, A_5^{α}, A_7^{α} can be estimated analogous to the corresponding terms in the proof of Lemma 4.4. Let us estimate the remaining A_i^{α} one by one: we have, using integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}A_1^{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,x&\le\frac{\|u\|_{C^2}}{c_\rho}\,\|u-u^{\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\,\|\rho-\rho^{\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}-\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\big(\nabla_x u-\nabla_x u^{\alpha}\big)(\sigma[u]-\sigma[u^{\alpha}])\,\mathrm{d}\,x\\&\le\frac{\|u\|_{C^2}}{c_\rho}\,\|u-u^{\alpha}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\,\|\rho-\bar\rho\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}\\&\le\frac{\|u\|_{C^2}}{c_\rho}\max\Big\{\frac{1}{c_\rho},\frac{4C_P}{C_\kappa}\Big\}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^{\alpha}\end{aligned} \tag{5.22}$$

as, by the properties of the Lamé coefficients, $\nabla_x(u^\alpha - u) : (\sigma[u^\alpha] - \sigma[u]) \geq 0$. For A_2^α we find using (2.26)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_2^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} -C_\kappa u \cdot (\nabla_x \Delta_x \rho - \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha)(\rho - \rho^\alpha) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
=&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} -C_\kappa (\rho - c^\alpha) u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x (\rho - c^\alpha) - C_\kappa (c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha) u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x (\rho - c^\alpha) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
=&C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} -u \cdot \mathrm{div}_x \Big(\Big((\rho - c^\alpha)\Delta_x(\rho - c^\alpha) + \frac{|\nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha)|^2}{2} \Big) \mathbb{I} - \nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha) \otimes \nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha) \Big) \\
&\qquad - (c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha) u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho + (c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha) u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
=&C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \mathrm{div}_x(u) \Big((\rho - c^\alpha)\Delta_x(\rho - c^\alpha) + \frac{|\nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha)|^2}{2} \Big) - \nabla_x u : \nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha) \otimes \nabla_x(\rho - c^\alpha) \\
&\qquad - (c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha) u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho + \frac{1}{\alpha} \Delta_x c^\alpha u \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
\leq& C_\kappa \left\| \nabla_x \,\mathrm{div}_x(u) \right\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \rho - c^\alpha \right\|_{H^1}^2 + \frac{3C_\kappa}{2} \left\| \nabla_x u \right\|_{L^\infty} \left\| \rho - c^\alpha \right\|_{H^1}^2 \\
&+ C_\kappa \| c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \|_{L^2} \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \left\| u \right\|_{C^0} - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \frac{C_\kappa}{\alpha} \,\mathrm{div}_x(u) (\Delta_x c^\alpha)^2 \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
\leq& 3 \left\| u \right\|_{C^2} C_\kappa \left\| \rho - c^\alpha \right\|_{H^1}^2 + C_\kappa \| c^\alpha - \rho^\alpha \|_{L^2} \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \left\| u \right\|_{C^0} + C_\kappa \alpha \left\| u \right\|_{C^1} \left\| \rho^\alpha - c^\alpha \right\|_{L^2}^2 \\
\leq& \big(6 \left\| u \right\|_{C^2} C_P + \frac{2}{\alpha} \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \left\| u \right\|_{C^0} \big) \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

For A_6^α we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_6^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\, x = C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_x \rho (c_t^\alpha - \rho_t^\alpha) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
&\quad = C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \Delta_x \rho (G_\alpha[\mathrm{div}_x(m^\alpha)] - \mathrm{div}_x(m^\alpha)) \,\mathrm{d}\, x = -C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho \cdot (G_\alpha[m^\alpha] - m^\alpha) \,\mathrm{d}\, x \\
&\quad = -C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho \cdot (G_\alpha[m] - m) \,\mathrm{d}\, x - C_\kappa \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho \cdot (G_\alpha[m^\alpha - m] - (m^\alpha - m)) \,\mathrm{d}\, x
\end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

such that elliptic regularity for the operator G_α implies

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big| \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_6^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\, x \Big| &\leq \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \frac{1}{\alpha} \left| m \right|_{H^2} + 2C_\kappa \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \left\| m^\alpha - m \right\|_{L^2} \\
&\leq \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \frac{1}{\alpha} \left| m \right|_{H^2} + 2C_\kappa \left\| \rho \right\|_{C^3} \frac{16 C_P c_m^2}{c_\rho^2} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha \,,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

see Lemma 5.7. In order to estimate A_8^α we decompose it as $-A_8^\alpha = A_{81}^\alpha + A_{82}^\alpha$ with

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{81}^\alpha &= \big(h'(\rho) - h'(c^\alpha) \big) \big(\mathrm{div}_x(m^\alpha) - \mathrm{div}_x(m) \big) \,, \\
A_{82}^\alpha &= \big(h'(c^\alpha) - h'(\rho^\alpha) \big) \big(\mathrm{div}_x(m^\alpha) - \mathrm{div}_x(m) \big) \,.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.26}$$

Using integration by parts we find

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{81}^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\,x &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \big(h''(\rho)\nabla_x\rho - h''(c^\alpha)\nabla_x c^\alpha\big)\cdot\big(m-m^\alpha\big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \big(h''(\rho)\nabla_x\rho - h''(c^\alpha)\nabla_x\rho\big)\cdot\big(m-m^\alpha\big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \big(h''(c^\alpha)\nabla_x\rho - h''(c^\alpha)\nabla_x c^\alpha\big)\cdot\big(m-m^\alpha\big)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

such that

$$\big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{81}^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\,x\big| \le h_M \,\|\rho\|_{C^1}\,\|\rho - c^\alpha\|_{L^2}\,\|m^\alpha - m\|_{L^2} + h_M\,|\rho - c^\alpha|_{H^1}\,\|m^\alpha - m\|_{L^2}\,, \tag{5.28}$$

because of Remark 5.5. We infer

$$\big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{81}^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\,x\big| \le h_M(\|\rho\|_{C^1}+1)\frac{C_P c_m^2}{4C_\kappa c_\rho^2}\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha\,, \tag{5.29}$$

due to (5.16). Finally, we turn to A_{82}^α and obtain

$$A_{82}^\alpha = (h'(c^\alpha) - h'(\rho^\alpha))\rho^\alpha \operatorname{div}_x u^\alpha + (h'(c^\alpha) - h'(\rho^\alpha))\nabla_x\rho^\alpha\cdot u^\alpha - (h'(c^\alpha) - h'(\rho^\alpha))\operatorname{div}_x m$$

such that, using Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{82}^\alpha \,\mathrm{d}\,x\big| \le{}& \frac{C_\kappa\alpha}{2}\,\|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\\ &+ \frac{2h_M}{\alpha C_\kappa}\big(\,\|\operatorname{div}_x m\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + C_\rho\,\|\operatorname{div}_x u^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\big) + \big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{83}^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\,x\big|\,,\end{aligned} \tag{5.30}$$

where $A_{83}^\alpha := (h'(c^\alpha) - h'(\rho^\alpha))\nabla_x\rho^\alpha\cdot u^\alpha$, for α sufficiently large and some constant $C_\rho > 0$, according to (5.6). We have, using integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} A_{83}^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\,x\big| &= \big|\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} h'(c^\alpha)\nabla_x(\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha)\cdot u^\alpha - \nabla_x(h(\rho^\alpha) - h(c^\alpha))\cdot u^\alpha\,\mathrm{d}\,x\big|\\ &\le \frac{C_\kappa\alpha}{2}\,\|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \Big(\frac{3h_M^2}{C_\kappa\alpha}\,\|\nabla_x c^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \frac{2}{C_\kappa\alpha}\,\|\operatorname{div}_x u^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\Big)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

Note that $\frac{C_\kappa\alpha}{2}\,\|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \le \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha$.

The assertion of the lemma follows upon combining (5.23), (5.25), (5.29),(5.30), and (5.31) because of (5.5), (5.6), and Remark 5.8. □

Remark 5.13 (Boundary conditions)**.** If we used natural boundary conditions instead of periodic ones, we would obtain additional (non-vanishing) boundary terms in the estimate of A_6^α, and it is not clear how to estimate them properly.

Theorem 5.14 (Model convergence)**.** *Let $T, \mu, C_\kappa > 0$ and $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$ be fixed such that* (5.4) *is satisfied. Let initial data $(\rho_0, u_0)\in H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)\times H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)$ be given such that a strong solution (ρ, u) of* (2.38) *exists in the sense of* (5.5)*. Let the sequence $(\rho_0^\alpha, u_0^\alpha)$ be such that* (5.3) *is satisfied and that strong solutions $(\rho^\alpha, u^\alpha, c^\alpha)$ of* (5.1) *exist in the sense of* (5.5)*. Let, in addition,* (5.6) *be satisfied. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ depending only on $T, \lambda, \mu, C_\kappa, \rho_0, u_0$ such that for sufficiently large α the following estimate holds:*

$$\frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,|\rho - c^\alpha|_{L^\infty(0,T;H^1(\mathbb{T}^3))}^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,\|\rho^\alpha - c^\alpha\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))}^2 + \frac{c_\rho}{2}\,\|u^\alpha - u\|_{L^\infty(0,T;L^2(\mathbb{T}^3))}^2 \le \frac{C}{\alpha}\,.$$

Proof. Integrating (5.21) in time we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le C\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(s,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,\mathrm{d}\,s + \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(0,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x + \int_0^t \frac{|E(s)|}{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,s \tag{5.32}$$

such that Gronwall's inequality implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le \Big(\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(0,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x + \int_0^t \frac{|E(s)|}{\alpha}\,\mathrm{d}\,s\Big)e^{Ct}. \tag{5.33}$$

In order to infer the assertion of the theorem, from (5.33) we need to estimate the integral of $\eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(0,\cdot)$. Because of (5.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(0,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le \frac{\alpha C_\kappa}{2}\,\|c^\alpha(0,\cdot)-\rho_0^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \\ + \frac{C_\kappa}{2C_P}\|c^\alpha(0,\cdot)-\rho_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + C_\rho\,\|u_0^\alpha-u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

By definition $c^\alpha(0,\cdot) = G_\alpha[\rho_0^\alpha]$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\|c^\alpha(0,\cdot)-\rho_0^\alpha\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 &\le \frac{1}{\alpha^2}\,|\rho_0^\alpha|_{H^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\,,\\ \frac{1}{C_P}\|c^\alpha(0,\cdot)-\rho_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 &\le \frac{2}{\alpha^2}\,|\rho_0^\alpha|_{H^3(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \|\rho_0^\alpha-\rho_0\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

Inserting (5.35) and (5.3) into (5.34) we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(0,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x = \mathcal{O}(\alpha^{-1})\,. \tag{5.36}$$

Upon using (5.36) in (5.33) we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x \le \Big(\frac{C}{\alpha}+\frac{1}{\alpha}\|E\|_{L^1(0,t)}\Big)e^{Ct} \tag{5.37}$$

for some constant $C>0$, independent of α. Equation (5.37) implies the assertion of the theorem as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{C_\kappa}{2C_P}\|\rho(t,\cdot)-c^\alpha(t,\cdot)\|_{H^1(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 + \frac{C_\kappa}{2}\,\|\rho^\alpha(t,\cdot)-c^\alpha(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \\ + \frac{c_\rho}{2}\,\|u^\alpha(t,\cdot)-u(t,\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{T}^3)}^2 \le \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \eta_{\mathrm{R}}^\alpha(t,x)\,\mathrm{d}\,x\,.\end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

□

Remark 5.15 (Parameter dependence)**.** All the estimates derived in this section heavily rely on the capillary regularization terms which are scaled with C_κ. In particular, the estimates of Theorems 4.5 and 5.14 depend sensitively on C_κ. Indeed, the constants C in Theorems 4.5 and 5.14 scale like $\exp(1/C_\kappa)$ for $C_\kappa \to 0$. Thus, the results established here are only helpful in the diffuse case $C_\kappa > 0$ and cannot be transferred to the sharp interface limit case $C_\kappa \to 0$.

Appendix A. Noether's theorem and the Korteweg stress

In this section we show that the relation (2.5) (or (2.25)) for the Euler-Korteweg system (2.24) can be seen as a direct consequence of Noether's theorem and the invariance of the Korteweg functional

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \int_\Omega F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho)\, d\rho \tag{A.1}$$

under translations. This relation is pointed out by Benzoni-Gavage [3] and is proved under the hypothesis that $\rho(\cdot)$ is an extremum of $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ under the constraint of prescribed mass $\int \rho$.

Here, we will show that if Ω is a set that makes the functional invariant under translations, that is $\mathcal{E}(\rho(\cdot + h)) = \mathcal{E}(\rho(\cdot))$, then Noether's theorem implies (2.25) without any further assumptions on $\rho(\cdot)$. Note that the invariance under translations holds if Ω is the d-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ or the entire space $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Indeed, the proof of this is a direct application of Noether's theorem on (A.1) (see Gelfand and Fomin [18, Sec 37]). Following the outline of Sec 37, we note that the functional (A.1) is invariant under the transformation

$$\begin{cases} x_i^* = x_i + \sum_k \varepsilon_k \delta_{ik} \quad i = 1, ..., d\,, \\ \rho^* = \rho\,. \end{cases} \tag{A.2}$$

The first variation of the functional $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ along variations compatible with (A.2) is zero. Applying Theorem 1 in [18, Sec 37.4], which computes the first variation of $\mathcal{E}(\rho)$ on a general domain, we see that the invariance implies

$$-\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_k}\left(F_\rho - \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} F_{q_i}\right) - \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(F_{q_i}\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_k} - F\delta_{ik}\right) = 0\,.$$

After an integration by parts, this formula readily yields

$$-\rho\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}\left(F_\rho - \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} F_{q_i}\right) = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\left(\big(F - \rho F_\rho + \rho\, \mathrm{div}_x\, F_q\big)\delta_{ik} - F_{q_i}\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial x_k}\right) \tag{A.3}$$

which coincides with (2.25) or (2.5).

Appendix B. The relative energy transport identity for the Euler-Korteweg system

We present here the relative entropy calculation for the Euler-Korteweg system when both $(\rho,\, m)$ and $(\bar\rho,\, \bar m)$ are smooth solutions of (3.1); the framework of weak solution $(\rho,\, m)$ is discussed in Section 3.2. This calculation will determine explicitly the relative-energy flux (a term omitted in the integral version valid for weak solutions).

In what follows, we often omit the dependence of the potential energy

$$F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) = h(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\kappa(\rho)|\nabla_x \rho|^2,$$

the stress

$$S = -\big(\rho F_\rho(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) - F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) - \rho\, \mathrm{div}_x(F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho))\big)\mathbb{I} - F_q(\rho, \nabla_x \rho) \otimes \nabla_x \rho$$

and their derivatives on the variables ρ and $\nabla_x \rho$, and we denote with $\bar F$ and $\bar S$ these quantities when evaluated for the solution $\bar\rho$.

We start by analyzing the linear part of the potential energy about $\bar\rho$, that is:

$$\bar F_\rho(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_q\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)=\Big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x\big(\bar F_q\big)\Big)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\operatorname{div}_x\big(\bar F_q(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\,.$$

Using the equation satisfied by the difference $(\rho-\bar\rho)$, after some calculation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t\Big(\bar F_\rho(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_q\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)+\operatorname{div}_x\Big(\big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q)\big)(m-\bar m)+\bar F_q\operatorname{div}_x(m-\bar m)\Big)\\
&\quad=\nabla_x\big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q)\big)\cdot(m-\bar m)-\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\big)(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\quad-\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m-\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\,.
\end{aligned}\tag{B.1}$$

Using

$$\partial_tF(\rho,\nabla_x\rho)+\operatorname{div}_x\Big(m\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)\big)+F_q\operatorname{div}_x m\Big)=m\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)\big)\tag{B.2}$$

for both $(\rho,\,m)$ and $(\bar\rho,\,\bar m)$ and (B.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_tF(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)+\operatorname{div}_x\Big(m\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)+(F_q-\bar F_q)\operatorname{div}_x m\Big)\\
&=m\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\\
&\quad+\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\big)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\\
&\quad+\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\\
&=\rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\\
&\quad+\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\rho\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\\
&\quad+\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\big)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\\
&\quad+\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\\
&=D+I_1+I_2\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
D&=\rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\,;\\
I_1&=\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\rho\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\,;\\
I_2&=\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\bar m+\bar F_{\rho q}\cdot\nabla_x(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\big)(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{q\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\\
&\quad+\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\partial_{x_i}(\operatorname{div}_x\bar m)\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling

$$\rho\partial_{x_j}\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)\big)=-\partial_{x_k}S_{kj}\,,\tag{B.3}$$

I_1 is rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1&=\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\Big(\rho\partial_{x_j}\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)\big)-\bar\rho\partial_{x_j}\big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q)\big)\Big)-(\rho-\bar\rho)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\\
&=-\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_k}\big(S_{kj}-\bar S_{kj}\big)-(\rho-\bar\rho)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\,,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t F(\rho, \nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x\bar\rho)\\
&\quad + \operatorname{div}_x\left(m\big(F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big) + (F_q - \bar F_q)\operatorname{div}_x m + \big(S-\bar S\big)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\\
&= D - \partial_{x_k}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\big(\rho F_\rho - F - \rho\operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar\rho\bar F_\rho - \bar F - \bar\rho\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\delta_{kj} + F_{q_k}\partial_{x_j}\rho - \bar F_{q_k}\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\Big)\\
&\quad - (\rho-\bar\rho)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\bar F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q)) + I_2\\
&= D - I_{1a} - I_{1b} + I_2\,, \qquad\qquad (B.4)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{1a} &= \partial_{x_k}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\big(\rho F_\rho - F - \rho\operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar\rho\bar F_\rho - \bar F - \bar\rho\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\delta_{kj} + F_{q_k}\partial_{x_j}\rho - \bar F_{q_k}\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\Big)\,;\\
I_{1b} &= (\rho-\bar\rho)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\bar F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

After some rearrangement of derivatives I_2 becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho} - \partial_{x_i}(\bar F_{\rho q_i})\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_j} - \partial_{x_i}(\bar F_{q_j q_i})\big)\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\quad - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_i}\partial_{x_i}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{q_j q_i}\partial_{x_i x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\Big)\\
&\quad + \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\Big(\partial_{x_j}\big(\bar F_\rho\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) + \partial_{x_j}\big(\bar F_{q_l}\big)\partial_{x_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) - \partial_{x_l}\big(\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{q_k q_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\big)\Big)\\
&\quad + \operatorname{div}_x\Big(\big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\Big)\\
&= I_{2a} + I_{2b} - I_{2c} + I_{2d}\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{2a} &= \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{\rho q})\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_j} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{q_j q})\big)\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\qquad - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_i}\partial_{x_i}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{q_j q_i}\partial_{x_i x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\Big)\,;\\
I_{2b} &= \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\Big(\partial_{x_j}\big(\bar F_\rho\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) + \partial_{x_j}\big(\bar F_{q_l}\big)\partial_{x_l}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,;\\
I_{2c} &= \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\Big(\partial_{x_l}\big(\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{q_k q_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\big)\Big)\,;\\
I_{2d} &= \operatorname{div}_x\Big(\big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\Big)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

We shall now rearrange the various terms defined above as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-I_{1b} + I_{2b} &= \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_l}\partial_{x_j}\big((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\big) - \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\right) + \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\big(\bar F_{q_l}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\,;\\
-I_{2c} &= -\partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\Big(\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{q_k q_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\right)\\
&\qquad + \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{q_k q_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Using the above relations in (B.4) we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\partial_t F(\rho, \nabla_x \rho\,|\bar\rho, \nabla_x\bar\rho) + \operatorname{div}_x J_1 = D \\
&\quad - \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\big(\rho F_\rho - F - \rho\operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar\rho\bar F_\rho - \bar F - \bar\rho\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\\
&\quad - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{\rho q})\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_j} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{q_j q})\big)\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\quad + \bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_i}\partial_{x_i}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar\rho\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_ix_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\\
&\quad - \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(F_{q_l}\partial_{x_j}\rho - \bar F_{q_l}\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho - \partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) - \partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{q_kq_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho) - \bar F_{q_l}\delta_{jk}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\\
&\quad + \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_l}\partial_{x_j}\big((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\big) - \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\right)\\
&= D - R_1 - R_2 + R_3\,,
\end{aligned}
\tag{B.5}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
J_1 &= m\big(F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big) + (F_q - \bar F_q)\operatorname{div}_x m\\
&\quad + \big(S-\bar S\big)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho} - \big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\\
&\quad + \left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x\bar\rho\right)\Big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,;\\
R_1 &= \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\big(\rho F_\rho - F - \rho\operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - (\bar\rho\bar F_\rho - \bar F - \bar\rho\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\\
&\quad - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{\rho q})\big)(\rho-\bar\rho) - \bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_j} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{q_j q})\big)\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\\
&\quad + \bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_i}\partial_{x_i}(\rho-\bar\rho) + \bar\rho\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_ix_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,;\\
R_2 &= \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(F_{q_l}\partial_{x_j}\rho - \bar F_{q_l}\partial_{x_j}\bar\rho - \partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_l}(\rho-\bar\rho) - \partial_{x_j}\bar\rho\bar F_{q_kq_l}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho) - \bar F_{q_l}\delta_{jk}\partial_{x_k}(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\,;\\
R_3 &= \frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_l}\partial_{x_j}\big((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\big) - \partial_{x_l}\left(\frac{\bar m_j}{\bar\rho}\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_{q_l}\right)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we recall the notations

$$
\begin{aligned}
H(\rho,q) &= q\otimes F_q(\rho,q)\,,\\
s(\rho,q) &= \rho F_\rho(\rho,q) + q\cdot F_q(\rho,q) - F(\rho,q)\,,\\
r(\rho,q) &= \rho F_q(\rho,q)\,,
\end{aligned}
$$

and we readily obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
R_2 &= \nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right) : H(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,;\\
\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho\rho} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{\rho q})\big) &= s_\rho(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) - \operatorname{div}_x\left(\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q}\right)\,;\\
\bar\rho\big(\bar F_{\rho q_j} - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_{q_j q})\big) &= s_{q_j}(\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho) - \operatorname{div}_x\left(\bar\rho\bar F_{q_j q}\right)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}-R_1+R_3 &= \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\left((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_q\right)-\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\right)\bar F_q\right)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\\ &\quad+\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\Big(\operatorname{div}_x\left(\rho F_q\right)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\bar\rho\bar F_q\right)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q}\right)(\rho-\bar\rho)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\bar\rho\bar F_{q_jq}\right)\partial_{x_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)\\ &\quad-\bar\rho\bar F_{\rho q_i}\partial_{x_i}(\rho-\bar\rho)-\bar\rho\bar F_{q_jq_i}\partial_{x_ix_j}(\rho-\bar\rho)-\operatorname{div}_x\left((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_q\right)\Big)\\ &=-\operatorname{div}_x J_2-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)-\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$J_2=-\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\left((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_q\right)-\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\right)\bar F_q\right)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,.$$

Using these identities in (B.5) we finally express the relative potential energy in the form:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)+\operatorname{div}_x J &= D-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\\ &\quad-\nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right):H(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)-\nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\,,\end{aligned}\tag{B.6}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}J&=J_1+J_2\\ &=m\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)+(F_q-\bar F_q)\operatorname{div}_x m\\ &\quad+\big(S-\bar S\big)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}-\big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\big)\operatorname{div}_x\bar m\\ &\quad+\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x\bar\rho\right)\Big(\bar F_{\rho q}(\rho-\bar\rho)+\bar F_{qq}\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\Big)\\ &\quad-\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\operatorname{div}_x\left((\rho-\bar\rho)\bar F_q\right)-\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\cdot\nabla_x(\rho-\bar\rho)\right)\bar F_q\right)-\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar\rho,\nabla_x\bar\rho)\end{aligned}\tag{B.7}$$

and

$$D=\rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q))\big)\,.$$

The density of the relative kinetic energy is given by

$$\frac12\rho\left|\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right|^2.\tag{B.8}$$

We recall (3.5) and (B.2) (see also (B.3)) and thus the kinetic energy alone satisfies

$$\partial_t\left(\frac12\frac{|m|^2}{\rho}\right)+\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac12 m\frac{|m|^2}{\rho^2}\right)=-m\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)\big)\,.$$

We write the difference for the equations satisfied by $\frac{m}{\rho}$ and $\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)+\left(\frac{m}{\rho}\cdot\nabla_x\right)\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)+\left(\left(\frac{m}{\rho}-\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\right)\cdot\nabla_x\right)\frac{\bar m}{\bar\rho}\\ &=-\nabla_x\big(F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(F_q)-\big(\bar F_\rho-\operatorname{div}_x(\bar F_q)\big)\big)\,,\end{aligned}$$

and multiply by $\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\partial_t \left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2 + \left(\frac{m}{\rho}\cdot\nabla_x\right)\left(\frac{1}{2}\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2\right) + \left(\frac{m_i}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}_i}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\left(\frac{m_j}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}_j}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\partial_{x_j}\left(\frac{\bar{m}_i}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\\ &\quad = -\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\cdot\nabla_x\big(F_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(F_q) - \big(\bar{F}_\rho - \operatorname{div}_x(\bar{F}_q)\big)\big)\,.\end{aligned}$$

Using the conservation law $(3.1)_1$, we end up with

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2\right) + \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{1}{2}m\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2\right)\\ &\qquad = -D - \rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\otimes\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) : \nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\,.\end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

Adding (B.6) and (B.9) leads to the identity for the transport of the relative energy,

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_t\left(\frac{1}{2}\rho\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2 + F(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho},\nabla_x\bar{\rho})\right) + \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{1}{2}m\left|\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right|^2 + J\right)\\ &= -\rho\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\otimes\left(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) : \nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) - \operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)s(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho},\nabla_x\bar{\rho})\\ &- \nabla_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right) : H(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho},\nabla_x\bar{\rho}) - \nabla_x\operatorname{div}_x\left(\frac{\bar{m}}{\bar{\rho}}\right)\cdot r(\rho,\nabla_x\rho\,|\bar{\rho},\nabla_x\bar{\rho})\,,\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

where the flux J is defined in (B.7).

Appendix C. Proof of Lemma 5.9

The sole purpose of this appendix is giving the details of the proof of Lemma 5.9.

Proof of Lemma 5.9. We start with direct calculations

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_t^\alpha =& h'(\rho^\alpha)\rho_t^\alpha + \frac{m^\alpha\cdot m_t^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} - \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{2(\rho^\alpha)^2}\rho_t^\alpha + \alpha C_\kappa(\rho - c^\alpha)(\rho_t^\alpha - c_t^\alpha)\\ &+ C_\kappa\nabla_x c^\alpha\cdot\nabla_x c_t^\alpha - h(\rho)\rho_t + C_\kappa\nabla_x\rho\cdot\nabla_x\rho_t - h''(\rho)\rho_t(\rho^\alpha - \rho) - h'(\rho)\rho_t^\alpha\\ &+ h'(\rho)\rho_t + \frac{m\cdot m_t}{\rho^2}\rho^\alpha - \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^3}\rho^\alpha\rho_t + \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^2}\rho_t^\alpha\\ &- C_\kappa\nabla_x\rho_t\cdot\nabla_x c^\alpha - C_\kappa\nabla_x\rho\cdot\nabla_x c_t^\alpha - \frac{m_t\cdot m^\alpha}{\rho} - \frac{m\cdot m_t^\alpha}{\rho} + \frac{m\cdot m^\alpha}{\rho^2}\rho_t\end{aligned} \tag{C.1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{div}_x q^\alpha = {} & \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) h'(\rho^\alpha) + m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x h'(\rho^\alpha) + \frac{m^\alpha \otimes m^\alpha}{(\rho^\alpha)^2} : \nabla_x m^\alpha + \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{2(\rho^\alpha)^2} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) \\
& - \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{(\rho^\alpha)^3} m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \rho^\alpha - \nabla_x h'(\rho) \cdot m^\alpha - h'(\rho) \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + \frac{m \otimes m^\alpha}{\rho^2} : \nabla_x m \\
& + \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) - \frac{|m|^2}{\rho^3} m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \rho - \frac{m \otimes m^\alpha}{\rho \rho^\alpha} : \nabla_x m^\alpha - \frac{m^\alpha \otimes m^\alpha}{\rho \rho^\alpha} : \nabla_x m \\
& - \frac{m \cdot m^\alpha}{\rho \rho^\alpha} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + \frac{m \cdot m^\alpha}{\rho^2 \rho^\alpha} m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \rho + \frac{m \cdot m^\alpha}{\rho (\rho^\alpha)^2} m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \rho^\alpha - \frac{\operatorname{div}_x(m)}{\rho} p(\rho^\alpha) \\
& + \frac{m \cdot \nabla_x \rho}{\rho^2} p(\rho^\alpha) - \frac{m \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho^\alpha)}{\rho} + \frac{\operatorname{div}_x(m)}{\rho} p(\rho) - \frac{m \cdot \nabla_x \rho}{\rho^2} p(\rho) + \frac{m \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho)}{\rho} .
\end{aligned} \tag{C.2}$$

Inserting the evolution equations (2.38) and (5.1) in (C.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_t^\alpha = {} & \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{(\rho^\alpha)^3} \nabla_x \rho \cdot m^\alpha - \frac{m^\alpha \otimes m^\alpha}{(\rho^\alpha)^2} : \nabla_x m^\alpha - \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{(\rho^\alpha)^2} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) - \frac{m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho^\alpha)}{\rho^\alpha} + \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) \\
& + C_\kappa m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha + \frac{|m^\alpha|^2}{2(\rho^\alpha)^2} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + C_\kappa \Delta_x c^\alpha \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + C_\kappa \operatorname{div}_x(\nabla_x c^\alpha c_t^\alpha) \\
& - C_\kappa \nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x \operatorname{div}_x(m) + h''(\rho) \operatorname{div}_x(m)(\rho^\alpha - \rho) + |m|^2 \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^4} m \cdot \nabla_x \rho - \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^3} m \otimes m : \nabla_x m \\
& - \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^3} |m|^2 \operatorname{div}_x(m) - \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^2} m \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho) + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^2} m \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) + C_\kappa \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho} m \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^3} |m|^2 \operatorname{div}_x(m) \\
& - \frac{|m|^2}{2\rho^2} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + C_\kappa \nabla_x \operatorname{div}_x(m) \cdot \nabla_x c^\alpha + C_\kappa \Delta_x \rho (c_t^\alpha - \rho_t^\alpha) - C_\kappa \operatorname{div}_x(c_t^\alpha \nabla_x \rho) \\
& + C_\kappa \nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) - \frac{m \cdot m^\alpha}{\rho^3} \nabla_x \rho \cdot m + \frac{m^\alpha \otimes m}{\rho^2} : \nabla_x m + \frac{\operatorname{div}_x(m)}{\rho^2} m \cdot m^\alpha + \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho} \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho) \\
& - \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) - C_\kappa m^\alpha \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x \rho - \frac{m^\alpha \cdot m}{\rho (\rho^\alpha)^2} \nabla_x \rho^\alpha \cdot m^\alpha + \frac{m \otimes m^\alpha}{\rho \rho^\alpha} : \nabla_x m^\alpha \\
& + \frac{m \cdot m^\alpha}{\rho \rho^\alpha} \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha) + \frac{m}{\rho} \cdot \nabla_x p(\rho^\alpha) - \frac{m}{\rho} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) - C_\kappa \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho} m \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x c^\alpha - \frac{\operatorname{div}_x(m)}{\rho^2} m \cdot m^\alpha .
\end{aligned} \tag{C.3}$$

Adding (C.2) and (C.3) we observe that several terms cancel out and we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\eta_t^\alpha + \operatorname{div}_x q^\alpha \\
&= \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) + \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho^2} m \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) - \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u]) - \frac{m}{\rho} \cdot \operatorname{div}_x(\sigma[u^\alpha]) \\
&+ C_\kappa \operatorname{div}_x \Big((m^\alpha - m)\Delta_x(c^\alpha - \rho) + \nabla_x(c^\alpha - \rho) c_t^\alpha + \nabla_x \rho \operatorname{div}_x(m^\alpha - m) + \operatorname{div}_x(m) \nabla_x c^\alpha \Big) \\
&+ C_\kappa \Big(\frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho} - 1 \Big) m \cdot \nabla_x \Delta_x(\rho - c^\alpha) + C_\kappa \nabla_x \rho \cdot \nabla_x(\rho_t^\alpha - c_t^\alpha) \\
&+ \frac{1}{\rho^2} m \otimes \nabla_x \rho : \Big(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} \Big) \otimes \Big(\frac{m \rho^\alpha}{\rho} - m^\alpha \Big) \\
&+ \frac{1}{\rho^2} m \cdot \nabla_x \rho \big(p(\rho^\alpha) - p(\rho) - p'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha - \rho) \big) \\
&+ \frac{1}{\rho} \nabla_x m : \Big(m^\alpha - m \frac{\rho^\alpha}{\rho} \Big) \otimes \Big(\frac{m}{\rho} - \frac{m^\alpha}{\rho^\alpha} \Big) \\
&- \frac{1}{\rho} \operatorname{div}_x(m) \big(p(\rho^\alpha) - p(\rho) - p'(\rho)(\rho^\alpha - \rho) \big) \, .
\end{aligned}
\tag{C.4}
$$

Due to the periodic boundary conditions, (C.4) implies the assertion of the lemma. □

References

[1] Paolo Antonelli and Pierangelo Marcati. On the finite energy weak solutions to a system in quantum fluid dynamics. *Comm. Math. Physics*, **287** (2009), 657-686.

[2] S. Benzoni-Gavage, R. Danchin, S. Descombes and D. Jamet, Structure of Korteweg models and stability of diffuse interfaces. *Interfaces and free boundaries* **7** (2005), 371-414.

[3] Sylvie Benzoni-Gavage, Propagating phase boundaries and capillary fluids. Lecture Notes. 3ème cycle. Levico, 2010, pp.57. ⟨*cel* − 00582329⟩

[4] Deborah Brandon, Tao Lin, and Robert C. Rogers. Phase transitions and hysteresis in nonlocal and order-parameter models. *Meccanica* **30** (1995), 541–565. Microstructure and phase transitions in solids (Udine, 1994).

[5] Malte Braack and Andreas Prohl. Stable discretization of a diffuse interface model for liquid-vapor flows with surface tension. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* **47** (2013), 401–420

[6] Joshua Ballew and Konstantina Trivisa. Weakly dissipative solutions and weak-strong uniqueness for the Navier-Stokes-Smoluchowski system. *Nonlinear Anal.* **91** (2013), 1–19.

[7] Yann Brenier. Topology-preserving diffusion of divergence-free vector fields and magnetic relaxation. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **330** (2014), 757–770.

[8] Frédéric Charve. Local in time results for local and non-local capillary Navier–Stokes systems with large data. *J. Differential Equations* **256** (2014), 2152–2193.

[9] C. M. Dafermos. The second law of thermodynamics and stability. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **70** (1979), 167–179.

[10] C. M. Dafermos. Stability of motions of thermoelastic fluids. *J. Thermal Stresses* **2** (1979), 127–134.

[11] C. M. Dafermos, Quasilinear hyperbolic systems with involutions, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **94** (1986), 373-389.

[12] C. M. Dafermos. *Hyperbolic conservation laws in continuum physics*, volume 325 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, third edition, 2010.

[13] Ronald J. DiPerna. Uniqueness of solutions to hyperbolic conservation laws. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **28** (1979), 137–188.

[14] D. Donatelli, E. Feireisl, and P. Marcati. Well/ill posedness for the Euler–Korteweg–Poisson system and related problems. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations* **40** (2015), 1314–1335.
[15] J. E. Dunn and J. Serrin. On the thermomechanics of interstitial working. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* **88** (1985), 95–133.
[16] P. Engel, A. Viorel, and C. Rohde. A low-order approximation for viscous-capillary phase transition dynamics. *Port. Math.* **70** (2014), 319–344.
[17] E. Feireisl and A. Novotný. Weak-strong uniqueness property for the full Navier-Stokes-Fourier system. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **204** (2012), 683–706.
[18] I.M. Gelfand and S.V. Fomin, *Calculus of Variations*, Prentice Hall, 1963.
[19] J. Giesselmann. A relative entropy approach to convergence of a low order approximation to a nonlinear elasticity model with viscosity and capillarity. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, **46** (2014), 3518–3539.
[20] J. Giesselmann, Ch. Makridakis, and T. Pryer. Energy consistent dg methods for the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system. *Mathematics of Computation* **83** (2014), 2071–2099.
[21] R. S. Hamilton. The inverse function theorem of Nash and Moser. *Bulletin of AMS* **7**, 65–222, 1982.
[22] Qiangchang Ju, Hailiang Li, Yong Li and Song Jiang. Quasi-neutral limit of the two-fluid Euler-Poisson system. *Commun. Pure Appl. Anal.* **9** (2010), 1577–1590.
[23] M. Kotschote. Strong solutions for a compressible fluid model of Korteweg type. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* **25** (2008), 679–696.
[24] Corrado Lattanzio and Athanasios E. Tzavaras. Structural properties of stress relaxation and convergence from viscoelasticity to polyconvex elastodynamics. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.,* **180** (2006), 449–492.
[25] Corrado Lattanzio and Athanasios E. Tzavaras. Relative entropy in diffusive relaxation. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **45** (2013), 1563–1584.
[26] Corrado Lattanzio and Athanasios E. Tzavaras. From gas dynamics with large friction to gradient flows describing diffusion theories (forthcoming).
[27] Nicholas Leger and Alexis Vasseur. Relative entropy and the stability of shocks and contact discontinuities for systems of conservation laws with non-BV perturbations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **201** (2011), 271–302.
[28] Tao Luo and Joel Smoller. Existence and non-linear stability of rotating star solutions of the compressible Euler-Poisson equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* **191** (2009), 447–496.
[29] Jochen Neusser, Christian Rohde, and Veronika Schleper. Relaxation of the Navier-Stokes-Korteweg equations for compressible two-phase flow with phase transition. *Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids*, available online: http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/fld.4065
[30] Felix Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **26** (2001), 101–174.
[31] Y. Peng and Y. Wang, Convergence of compressible Euler-Poisson equations to incompressible type Euler equations, *Asymptotic Anal.*, **41** (2005), 141–160.
[32] X. Ren and L. Truskinovsky, Finite scale microstructures in nonlocal elasticity. *J. Elasticity*, **59** (2000), 319–355.
[33] Christian Rohde. A local and low-order Navier-Stokes-Korteweg system. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations and hyperbolic wave phenomena*, volume 526 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 315–337. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2010.
[34] Margherita Solci and Enrico Vitali. Variational models for phase separation. *Interfaces Free Bound.* **5** (2003), 27–46.
[35] L. Tian, Y Xu, J.G.M. Kuerten, J.J.W. Van der Vegt, A local discontinuous Galerkin method for the propagation of phase transition in solids and fluids. J. Sci. Comp. **9**(3) (2014), 688–720.

(Jan Giesselmann)
Institute of Applied Analysis and Numerical Simulation
University of Stuttgart
Pfaffenwaldring 57
D-70563 Stuttgart
Germany
E-mail address: jan.giesselmann@mathematik.uni-stuttgart.de

(Corrado Lattanzio)
Dipartimento di Ingegneria e Scienze dell'Informazione e Matematica
Università degli Studi dell'Aquila
Via Vetoio
I-67010 Coppito (L'Aquila) AQ
Italy
E-mail address: corrado@univaq.it

(Athanasios E. Tzavaras)
Computer, Electrical, Mathematical Sciences & Engineering Division
King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST)
Thuwal, Saudi Arabia
and
Institute for Applied and Computational Mathematics
Foundation for Research and Technology
GR 70013 Heraklion, Crete
Greece
E-mail address: athanasios.tzavaras@kaust.edu.sa